SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN

VOL. I — THE VERB

BY

CHARLES E. BENNETT

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Boston

ALLYN AND BACON

LEIPSIC: THEODOR STAUFFER

1910

PREFACE.

IN venturing to prepare a work to replace the now antiquated
Holtze, *Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum*, I have en-
deavored to bear in mind the stricter standards of syntactical
investigation imposed by the wider and exacter knowledge of
to-day. Where adequate monographs existed, I have made
use of them, but for most portions of the work I have been
compelled to make independent collections.

"Early Latin" is necessarily a somewhat vague term.
Holtze's work ended with Terence. Bell, *De locativi in prisca
Latinitate vi et usu*, Breslau, 1889, sets the later limit at 75 B.C.
A definite date is really impossible, since archaic Latin does not
terminate abruptly, but continues even down to imperial times.
For practical purposes I have chosen 100 B.C. as the later limit
of the archaic period, and have endeavored to consider all the
remains of any syntactical significance from the earliest period
down to this time. Had I extended the scope of the work for
another quarter of a century, the additions would have been
insignificant, — merely a few citations from the Sullan annalists
and contemporary inscriptions.

References are to the following editions: Plautus, Lindsay;
Terence, Dziatzko; Cato, De Agricultura, Keil; the fragments,
Jordan; fragments of the dramatists, Ribbeck; other poetic frag-
ments, Baehrens; fragments of the historians, Peter; fragments
of the orators, Meyer-Dübner (Paris, 1837). Figures in paren-
thesis indicate the number of occurrences of the usage which
they accompany. Examples without figures, unless accompa-
nied by " e.g.," are intended to represent the complete material
belonging under the given topic. In many instances the cita-
tions may seem to some readers unnecessarily full, but I have
so often been hampered in my own syntactical work by the

opposite defect that I have preferred to err by too copious, rather than too scanty, illustration. The fact is, it is impossible to foresee what particular information the student may seek in a syntactical manual; apparently gratuitous citations may therefore often prove of the greatest service.

In putting this volume through the press I have received most generous and valuable assistance from Professor Edwin W. Fay, Dr. Emory B. Lease, and my former pupil, Dr. Mary B. McElwain, to all of whom I here desire to express my sincere obligations.

The present volume will be followed at as early a date as practicable by the concluding portion of the work, on the cases, the adjectives, the pronouns, and the particles.

CHARLES E. BENNETT.

ITHACA, November, 1910.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

AGREEMENT, VOICES, IMPERSONAL VERBS, OMISSION OF VERB.

CHAPTER II.

TENSES OF THE INDICATIVE. (Especially in Principal Clauses.)

Table of Contents.

CHAPTER III.

THE INDICATIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

CHAPTER V.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMPERATIVE.

CHAPTER VII.

THE INFINITIVE.

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTICIPLES, GERUND, AND SUPINE, ETC.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SENTENCE-QUESTION.

SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN.

PART I.

THE VERB.

CHAPTER I.

AGREEMENT, VOICES, IMPERSONAL VERBS, OMISSION OF VERB.

AGREEMENT OF THE VERB.

AGREEMENT IN NUMBER.

1. With compound subject. Examples of a combination of singu-
lar subjects are not specially numerous. The plural verb is found:
Bacch. 886, et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio; Poen. 576, egredi-
untur Milphio una et vilicus; Pseud. 233, iam diu ego huic bene et
hic mihi volumus; And. 54, dum aetas metus magister prohibebant;
Ad. 213, ego vapulando, ille verberando usque ambo defessi sumus.
The singular: Amph. 249, namque ego fui illi et meus pater;
Aul. 217, quoniam tu me et ego te qualis sis scio; 276, probrum atque
partitudo prope adest; 580, tu, aula, multos inimicos habes atque
istuc aurum; 584, novisti me et ego te; 732, cui tanta mala maesti-
tudoque optigit; Cas. 314, si tu nolis filiusque tuos; M. G. 224,
qua cibatus commeatusque ad te possit pervenire; Most. 322,
visne ego te ac tu me amplectare; Poen. 203, sed Adelphasium
exit atque Anterastilis; Pseud. 906, me et Calidorum servatum
volunt esse; 1097, epistula atque imago me certum facit; Rud. 1411,
tu vidulum et ego gnatam inveni; Hec. 2, intervenit vitium et calami-
tas; Eun. 541, locus tempus constitutumst; Ad. 340, tua fama et
gnatae vita in dubium veniet; 470, persuasit nox amor vinum adu-
lescentia; 835, ne tuae nos rationes et tuos animus aequos subvortat;
Acc. 349, persuasit maeror anxitudo error dolor; Afran. 140, res

tempus locus simul otium hortabatur.   In these the singular is obvi-
ously due either to the tendency to make the verb agree with the
nearer subject, or to the fact that the different elements of the
compound subject are felt as constituting a whole.   The following
example is different: Ad. 76, hoc pater ac dominus interest, where
the subject is only formally compound.   Logically, *pater* alone is
the subject ('a father differs from a master').

2. Singular subjects connected by disjunctive particles.   Here we
find sometimes the singular, sometimes the plural.   Singular: Bacch.
79, quid si apud te eveniat prandium aut potatio?   Merc. 186, tam
certe quam ego te aut tu me vides; 653, quae patria aut domus
tibi stabilis esse poterit?   And. 463, utinam aut hic surdus aut haec
muta facta sit.   Plural: Ad. 103, haec si neque ego neque tu fecimus;
Naev. Trag. 37, egone an ille iniurie facimus?

3. Where the subject and predicate are of different numbers.

a) The verb agrees with its subject: And. 950, dos, Pamphile, est
decem talenta; Amph. 97, haec urbs est Thebae.

b) The verb is attracted to the number of the predicate: Asin. 155,
quae dicis aurum atque argentum est; Enn. Epicharm. 507, Iupiter
sunt ista quae dico tibi; And. 555, amantium irae amoris integra-
tiost; Ad. 6, Synapothnescontes Diphili comoediast.

4. Construction according to sense.   As a result of the meaning, we
find a plural verb with a singular subject in the following instances:

a) With *uterque:* Curc. 187, uterque insaniunt; Eun. 840, apud
Antiphonem uterque, mater et pater, domi erant (attraction to the
appositive); Cato, Agr. 70, facito ut uterque sublimiter stent.   In
the following passages, often cited as illustrations of a plural verb
with *uterque,* the *uterque* is probably rather in distributive apposition
with the subject: Bacch. 754, facite, cum amica sua uterque, adcubi-
tum eatis; Epid. 719, quam hodie per urbem uterque sumus defessi
quaerere; Trin. 623, celeri gradu eunt uterque; Ad. 130, curemus
aequam uterque partem.

b) With *uter, neuter:* Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam;
1119, uter eratis, tun an ille, maior? 784, quotiens edixi tibi ut
caveres neuter ad me iretis!

c) With *si quis:* Cato, fr. 23, 14, si quis advorsus rem suam quid
fieri arbitrantur; 62, 3, si quis alter ab altero peterent.

d) With *quisque:* Capt. 500, ubi quisque vident, eunt obviam; Epid. 212, filios suos quisque visunt; Most. 103, sibi quisque inde exemplum expetunt. In many examples cited in illustration of this use *quisque* is probably to be taken as in partitive apposition, e.g. Poen. 107, omnis meretrices, ubi quisque habitant, invenit.

e) With *quisquam:* Amph. 1071, neque nostrum quisquam sensimus; 1099, neque nostrum quisquam audivimus.

f) With *pars, partim:* Most. 114, sed magna pars morem hunc induxerunt; Capt. 232, fere maxuma pars morem hunc homines habent; Trin. 34, hic pluris pauciorum gratiam faciunt pars hominum; Truc. 105; fr. 29, maior pars populi reptant fame; Cato, fr. 23, 7, haut scio an partim eorum fuerint; 52, 12, sunt partim, qui petunt (the sing. 64, 8, quom partim illorum ad eundem modum erat); Enn. Ann. 44, pars saxa iactant, inter se licitantur.

g) With *aliquis:* Epid. 399, exite huc aliquis; Merc. 131, aperite aliquis; Acc. 425, Oeneum aliquis cette in conspectum. For further examples, see below under the imperative.

h) With *tantum hominum,* etc.: Poen. 619, quid huc tantum hominum incedunt? And. 745, quid illi hominum litigant!

i) With other expressions: Epid. 213, tum meretricum numerus tantus obviam ornatae occurrebant; Cato, fr. 19, 16, omnis Graecia gloriam decoravere monumentis; CIL, i, 196, 20, neve inter ibei virei plous duobus, mulieribus plous tribus arfuise velent; Trin. 425, tarpezitae mille drachumarum, quas de ratione dehibuisti, redditae; And. 625, hocine credibile, tanta vecordia quoiquam ut siet, ut malis gaudeant alterius; Cato, fr. 62, 6, si sponsionem fecissent Gellius cum Turio; H. T. 473, Syrus cum illo vostro consusurrant.

In expressions like Stich. 370, alius alium percontamur, I take *alius* as in partitive apposition with the subject; so also Curc. 378; Pseud. 1260, altera alterum inter se prehendunt.

AGREEMENT IN PERSON.

1. Where we have **subjects of different persons**, we find in Early Latin conformity with the usual practice of the later period, e.g. Bacch. 886, et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio; Pseud. 233, iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi volumus; Ad. 213, ego vapulando, ille verberando usque ambo defessi sumus; 103, haec si neque ego neque

tu fecimus. Yet often the verb is singular and agrees with the nearer subject, as Merc. 186, tam certe quam ego te aut tu me vides; Aul. 217, quoniam tu me et ego te qualis sis scio; 584; Most. 322; Rud. 1411, quem propter tu vidulum et ego gnatam inveni.

2. **Attraction of person.** A subject in the 3d singular is often attracted to the person (and number) of a genitive of the whole (*nostrum, vostrum*) expressed or understood:

a) 1st person: Amph. 1071, neque nostrum quisquam sensimus (for *quisquam sensit*); 1099, neque nostrum quisquam audivimus.

b) 2d person: Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam (for *uter meruit*); 1119, uter eratis, tun an ille, maior? 785, neuter ad me iretis; especially with the imperative in expressions like Epid. 399, exite huc aliquis; Merc. 131, aperite aliquis. The lack of a 3d person present imperative naturally leads to the use of the plural here, though the logical subject is singular (*aliquis vostrum*).

<center>THE VOICES.</center>

<center>PECULIARITIES IN THE USE OF THE ACTIVE.</center>

1. **Absolute use:** Amph. 352, tutatust domi; Eun. 780, solus Sannio servat domi; Cist. 104, ut hanc sinas hic servare apud me; Amph. 423, argumentis vicit; And. 185, meum gnatum rumor est amare; 191; Ad. 118; Amph. 243, equites iubet dextera inducere.

2. **Many verbs regularly used as transitive occur at times in an intransitive use:**

a) Verbs used as equivalent to reflexives:

ago: Bacch. 1106, unde agis? Pers. 216, quo agis? Poen. 333; but *quo te agis* occurs Trin. 1078.

aperio: Pers. 300, foris aperit.

applico: Enn. Trag. 77, quo applicem?

avorto: M. G. 203, ecce avortit; cf. Titin. 93, quo te avortisti?

capesso: Rud. 178, ad saxum quo capessit; cf. 172, horsum se capessit.

convorto: Stich. 414, in amicitiam convortimus; cf. Rud. 999, in vidulum te convortes.

habeo: Most. 709, quam habeat male; Phor. 429, bene habent principia.

insinuo: Cist. 92, in amicitiam insinuavit cum matre; cf. 89, insinuavit se.

lavo (-are): regularly used in reflexive sense in Early Latin: Amph. 802, lavisti, lavi; M. G. 251, dormit, ornatur, lavat; Stich. 568, ibo lautum; 569, lavero; Truc. 322; 323; And. 483, fac ista ut lavet; Eun. 592, accersitur lavatum; iit, lavit; 595; 596; Cato, Agr. 156, 3, lavet calida.

praebeo: Phor. 476, Phormio strenuom hominem praebuit.

recipio: Pers. 51, recipe quam primum potes; Bacch. 294, rursum in portum recipimus; Merc. 498; Rud. 880; but Merc. 881, recipiam me; Pers. 46, recipe te.

sisto: Curc. 287, nec quisquam quin capite sistat; M. G. 850.

suffulcio: Epid. 83, nisi suffulcis firmiter.

vorto: Amph. 251, vortentibus Telobois; Merc. 433, quo vortisti?

b) In the following the reflexive equivalence is not present:

aequipero: Pacuv. 407, aequiperent Iovi.

augeo: Cato, fr. 8, 6, eo res eorum auxit.

colo: Poen. 13, exerce vocem quam per vivisque et colis; Pseud. 202 a.

demuto: M. G. 1130, numquid demutare videtur?

expedio: Amph. 521, nequiter expedivit prima parasitatio.

grandire: Cato, Agr. 141, 2, vineta grandire siris!

habeo: Trin. 193, ubi nunc adulescens habet; 390.

incendo: Enn. Trag. 291, civitatem video Argivom incendere.

lenio: M. G. 583, dum haec irae leniunt.

quasso: Asin. 403, quassanti capite incedit; Bacch. 305; M. G. 851; 856.

suppedito: Eun. 1076, ut tuo amori suppeditare possint; Asin. 423; Trin. 1119.

vorto: Curc. 729, quae res bene vortat mi; Pers. 453; *et pass.*

3. Some verbs ordinarily intransitive are occasionally used transitively, e.g.: Eun. 550, erumpere gaudium; Cato, Agr. 157, 3; Men. 400, intra portam penetravi pedem; Trin. 837, ruere antemnas; Ad. 319. Reflexive uses: And. 562, ex illis sese emersurum malis; Amph. 250, perduelles penetrant se in fugam; Trin. 276, 291, me penetravi; 314; Truc. 44; Eun. 599, foras omnes proruont se.

Peculiarities in the Use of the Passive.

Passive as Reflexive.[1]

Examples:

accingor: Phor. 318, accingere!

adsimulor: M. G. 152, alia esse adsimulabitur.

amicior: Pers. 307, amicibor gloriose; Cas. 723.

aperior: Cas. 434, audio aperiri fores; 779; M. G. 527; 985; 1198; Trin. 400.

avortor: Amph. 927, ab impudicis dictis avorti volo.

cingor: Amph. 308, cingitur; certe expedit se.

comprimor: Most. 203, vix comprimor.

conicior: Poen. 69, conicitur ipse in morbum ex aegritudine.

convortor: Stich. 402, salvos convortor domum.

curor: Poen. 693, hospitium ubi curer mollius.

declinor: Hec. 200, neque declinatam ab aliarum ingenio ullam reperias.

dirumpor: Cas. 809, dirumpi cantando hymenaeum licet; 810.

dispertior: Curc. 189, etiam dispertimini?

fingor; fricor: see under *lavor.*

exunguor: Truc. 312, exunguimini.

inmutor: Phor. 206, non possum inmutarier.

lavor: Poen. 219, numquam concessamus lavari aut fricari aut tergeri aut ornari, poliri, expoliri, pingi, fingi; 228.

moveor: Asin. 788, illam moveri gestio.

obsaturor: H. T. 869, istius obsaturabere.

ornor: H. T. 288, quae ornantur sibi; Poen. 123, ibo; ornabor; see also under *lavor.*

pingor: see under *lavor.*

polior: see under *lavor.*

reprimor: M. G. 1368, vix reprimor.

retineor: Trin. 641, nam retineri nequeo quin dicam.

ringor: Phor. 341, ille ringitur.

rumpor: Afran. 127, risu rumpier.

---

[1] Nölting, Ueber das lateinische Deponens, 1859; Nausester, Beiträge zur Lehre vom Deponens und Passiv d. Lateinischen, 1907; Ernout, Recherches sur l'emploi du passif Latin, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xv, p. 322 ff.

simulor: Eun. 606, tum is essem, qui simulabar.

teneor: Cas. 239, vix teneor quin dicam.

tergeor: see under *lavor.*

unguor: Cas. 226, unguor.

vocor: Capt. 38, ille vocatur Philocrates, hic Tyndarus.

vortor: Most. 218, in anginam me velim vorti.

Different from the foregoing, in which the force is reflexive, are the following, which are indirect middles: Aul. 116, dexteras copulantur; Epid. 223, quid erat induta; 225, utin impluvium induta fuerit; Men. 190; 514; Rud. 207; Eun. 708, eamst indutus; 1016.

Attraction of Active Verbs into the Passive.

Several verbs governing the infinitive are attracted into the passive when the infinitive is passive or deponent:

coeptus sum: Men. 718, iure coepta appellarist Canes.

desitus sum: Most. 958, desitum est potarier.

intermissus est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum bibi.

nequitur, nequitum est: Rud. 1064, ut nequitur comprimi; Plaut. fr. 109, retrahi nequitur; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi; Cato, fr. 8, 17, id nequitum exaugurari.

occeptus sum: Eun. 22, occeptast agi.

osus sum: Amph. 900, osa sum optuerier.

potestur: Enn. fr. 574, retrahi potestur; Pacuv. 100, potestur investigari; Cato, Agr. 154, uti transferri possitur; CIL, i, 198, 66, ubi de plano legi possitur; Caelius (Peter), 100, 7, sine periculo bellum geri poteratur.

quitur, quitus sum: Stat. 279, non sarciri quitur; Acc. Baehr. 18, unde omnia perdisci ac percipi queuntur; Acc. Trag. 661, impelli quitus sum; Hec. 572, nosci non quitast.

IMPERSONAL USES.[1]

The verb is used impersonally with great freedom in Early Latin. In addition to the common *licet, oportet, decet, paenitet, piget, pudet,* and *est* with adjectives, we find very numerous instances of the impersonal use of the passive, of which the following illustrations are representative:

[1] Ernout, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xv, p. 290 ff.

1. In the uncompounded tenses of the indicative and subjunctive.

a) Present indicative: Pseud. 273, amatur atque egetur; Poen. 835, bibitur, estur; Capt. 80, caletur; always in this form in the impersonal use (*calet* is personal) ; so also Truc. 65; Poen. 890, creditur; Trin. 479, cernitur; H. T. 44, curritur; Bacch. 447, itur; so also Aul. 527; Pseud. 453; And. 480, fit; Pers. 386, nubitur; Pseud. 516, praedicitur; Rud. 1018, reditur; Phor. 778, siletur; Eun. 271, statur; so also Pseud. 457; Pers. 309, ut valetur? H. T. 154, vivitur; so also Trin. 65; Cato, Agr. 14, 1, iussitur. Deponent: Pacuv. 182, cuius a te veretur maxume; Atta, 7, nilne te populi veretur?

b) Future indicative (less frequent): Stich. 509, credetur; Cas. 131, curabitur; so also And. 403; 980, despondebitur; Poen. 734, dicetur; so H. T. 88; Cas. 758, ibitur; so Trin. 578; Cato, Agr. 88, 2, nubilabitur; 144, 1, debebitur; 145, 1, deducetur; 3, 6, ducetur; 1, 4, emetur; 4, peccabitur; CIL, i, 198, 24, petetur; so 26; 86; i, 200, 33, ambigetur; 69, comperietur.

c) Subjunctive (infrequent): Poen. 533, curratur; M. G. 946, ne quid titubetur; Cato, Agr. 39, 2, ne cessetur; 5, 7, substernatur; 66, 1, introeatur; CIL, i, 198, 49, 70, ioudicetur; so also 197, 10.

2. Compound tenses of the indicative.

a) Perfect: Pseud. 85, actum est; so also 1221; Stich. 751; Trin. 308; 595; 608; Amph. 219, exitum est; Poen. 909, paratum est; Men. 964, proventum est; Amph. 249, pugnatum est; Aul. 604, renuntiatum est; Merc. 511, solitum est; Stich. 467, sustentatum est; 586; Truc. 9, ventumst.

b) Future perfect: Bacch. 757, ubi erit accubitum; CIL, i, 198, 24, unde petitum erit; so 27.

3. The infinitive. For this very frequent impersonal use, see under the Infinitive (p. 413 f.).

4. The impersonal use of the second periphrastic conjugation. This occurs with great frequency, especially in the present indicative and the infinitive:

Examples: M. G. 35, adsentandum est; Poen. 567, agendum est; so 1243; Rud. 719; H. T. 321, audiundumst; 400, carendum erat; so M. G. 1210; Most. 1069, captandumst; so Acc. 541; Most. 701, cenandum et cubandumst; Pseud. 331, currendumst; Acc. 541, est eundum; Cas. 409, patiundumst; M. G. 180, pereundum est. Rarely in the

subjunctive: M. G. 170, optandum foret. Infinitive: Capt. 767, redauspicandum esse; M. G. 359, esse pereundum; Cas. 411, tibi cavendum censeo.

5. **Verbs ordinarily impersonal used in Early Latin as personal.** The following exemplify this usage: Aul. 491, quo lubeant nubant; Trin. 211, quod lubeant (lubeat P) sciant; And. 481, quae adsolent quaeque oportent; Stich. 51, me haec condicio non paenitet; Pacuv. 31, proloqui non (prologo nunc, codd) paenitebunt; Cas. 877, ita nunc pudeo; Ad. 754, non te haec pudent? Besides this we have, as later, the use of neuter singular pronouns with these impersonals, *e.g.* Epid. 107, idne te pudet? Ad. 84, quem neque pudet quicquam.

OMISSION OF THE VERB.[1]

The verb is frequently omitted in Early Latin, particularly forms of *sum*, especially in the function of auxiliary:

1st person sing.: Men. 614, ne ego ecastor mulier misera; M. G. 370, ego stulta quae cum hoc fabuler; 443; Rud. 520, quis vivit me miserior? : : ego multo miserior quam tu; Eun. 1062, quor ego in te conspicor regionibus? : : vobis fretus.

2d person sing.: Pers. 484, *iam liberta auctus* is now usually written *auctu's;* so other passages containing periphrastic forms or predicate adjectives in *-us.*

3d person sing.: M. G. 1041, hau mirum si te habes carum; Ad. 678, quid nobis cum illis? Eun. 511; Phor. 440, si quid opus fuerit, heus domo me (sc. arcessito); And. 300, verbum unum cave de nuptiis (sc. dicas), ne ad morbum hoc etiam (sc. accedat).

1st person plu.: Rud. 369, nos ventis iactatae perpetuam noctem; 690; Curc. 354, postquam cenati, talos poscit; And. 285, accessi, vos semotae, nos soli.

2d person plu.: Asin. 134, mare haud est mare: vos mare acerrimum; And. 285, accessi: vos semotae.

3d person plu.: Amph. 1133, quae futura et quae facta eloquar; 1061, ubi parturit, deos invocat, strepitus, crepitus, sonitus, tonitrus; Stich. 212, quot cenae mortuae! Eun. 780, ubi alii?

---

[1] Olsen, Quaestionum Plautinarum de verbo substantivo specimen, 1884; Meillet, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xiv, p. 1 ff.

CHAPTER II.

TENSES OF THE INDICATIVE.[1]

(ESPECIALLY IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.)

PRESENT TENSE.

In connection with the tenses of the indicative two important factors enter into consideration, viz.: the *kind of action* ("Aktionsart") and the *time-sphere* ("Zeitstufe") of the action or state. The present formations of Indo-European were not narrowly limited in either of these two respects. As regards the *kind of action*, they might designate the following varieties:

1) Momentary ("punktuell");
2) Progressive ("cursiv," "durativ");
3) Iterative, indicating the successive repetition of the same act;
4) Completed;
5) Terminative, in which an act in process at the same time suggests a definite terminus; see Delbrück, op. cit. ii, p. 14 ff.

Originally these different "Aktionsarten" seem to have been associated to a certain extent with specific types of present formation; ibid. p. 16 ff., but of this there is slight trace, if any, in Latin.

As regards *time-sphere*, the present indicative in Indo-European indicated, in the main, acts belonging to the speaker's present. An exception is found in the case of those present formations denoting momentary actions ("punktuelle Aktionsarten"). The time-sphere of these in Indo-European was the future; Delbrück, op. cit. p. 309. The Indo-European seems to have possessed also the timeless ("achronistic") use of the present indicative, i.e. its use in the statement of general truths, customs, etc. Delbrück, op. cit. p. 261, derives this use from that referring to the present, suggesting that, where adverbs meaning "always" were combined with the present,

[1] Herbig, Aktionsart und Zeitstufe, Indog. Forsch. vi, pp. 167 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 102 ff.; Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 1 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 491 ff.; 559 ff.

the timeless use might most naturally arise. But it seems more nat-
ural to regard the achronistic use as original.[1]

In Latin some scholars recognize only progressive action as
expressed by the present indicative. But I agree with those who
hold that the present expresses also momentary (aoristic) acts as
well. The latter usage, in fact, is of great frequency. Thus in
Most. 949, puere, nemo hic habitat, and in 950, non hic Philolaches
habitat? there seems no rational ground for recognizing progressive
action. *Habito*, to be sure, is a verb of durative meaning; but the
obvious sense is: 'lives,' not 'is living.' So in hundreds of instances
in which the present is used, e.g. M. G. 5, hanc machaeram consolari
volo; 31, nolo istaec nunc; 36, scio quid vis dicere; 49, offae monent;
72, videtur tempus esse ut eamus.

The time-sphere in Latin is ordinarily the speaker's present, but
the achronistic use is also not infrequent. Whether the historical
present and the present referring to the future come from the former
usage or the latter, is uncertain; see below.

<h2 style="text-align:center">VARIETIES OF THE PRESENT INDICATIVE.[2]</h2>

1. In general truths, statements of customs, etc. This use is com-
mon and presents no peculiarities worth notice. Examples are:
Capt. 232, morem hunc homines habent: quod sibi volunt, dum
impetrant, boni sunt; ubi iam penes sese habent, ex bonis pessumi
fiunt; And. 309, facile omnes, quom valemus, recta consilia aegrotis
damus. This usage is to be referred to the achronistic use of the
present indicative (see above, p. 10), i.e. the fact stated is repre-
sented as true not only for the speaker's present, but also as some-
thing that has been true in the past, and will be true in time to
come; cf. Herbig, op. cit. p. 159; 183.

2. The historical present.[3] This usage was Indo-European. Its
origin is variously explained. Some scholars regard it as resulting

---

[1] So Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 102.

[2] See, in general, Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 102 ff.; Methner, Tempus-
und Moduslehre, p. 110 ff.; Joseph Schneider, De temporum apud priscos scriptores
Latinos usu, 1888, p. 4 ff.

[3] Emery, Annie C., The Historical Present in Early Latin, 1897; Blase, Hist.
Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 103 ff.; Brugmann, Berichte der königlichen sächs.
Gesell. der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl. xxxv, p. 169.

from the dramatic picturing of past events as now occurring and as passing in imagination before the mind of the speaker or writer at the present time.   Others regard it as a development of the achronistic use of the present.   This view is supported by Hoffmann, Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum im Latein, p. 14; also by Brugmann, loc. cit.   Both of these scholars regard the reference to the past in the historical present as due to the context, the tense in this usage having originally been *per se* entirely timeless.   This attitude leads Brugmann to declare that, instead of recalling the past to the present in imagination, the writer or speaker rather puts himself back in the past.   Which of these two explanations of the origin of the usage is correct, cannot be determined.   Either is possible.   At all events, in the historical present the speaker views the occurrences " as if they were going on before his eyes in the sphere of his own present, whether he does this by bringing the events out of the past into his actual present, or by putting himself back into their past.   In either case he makes the present of the events his present." [1]

Emery (op. cit., p. 9 ff.) gives a complete list of all the verbs in Early Latin in which the historical present is found.   " An examination of the collection," she continues, " shows that it is chiefly verbs of incomplete and continued action, as opposed to verbs of momentary action, which tend toward the historical present.   These verbs of incomplete and continued action are verbs that imply vision on the part of the speaker.   They indicate that he is reviewing the events denoted by them and considering them in their process of completion instead of simply recognizing the fact that they once took place in the past " (p. 22).

Neither the premises nor the conclusions of the paragraph just quoted seem to me to be valid.   I cannot admit that an examination of the verbs in the list reveals any such predominance of verbs of durative character.   The list contains some two hundred and eighty different verbs, and it is obviously impossible to examine them here in detail. I will only observe that some eighty-two verbs in the list are admitted by the author to be either primarily verbs of momentary action, or verbs denoting both momentary and progressive action.   That the others, as a class, are far from denoting progressive action, will, I believe,

[1] Emery, op. cit., p. 23.

be clear to those who examine the entire list in detail. That this is true, may perhaps be indicated by taking at random a number of successive verbs held to belong in the main to the progressive class. Thus, p. 10, we have: respondeo, nomino, clamo, inclamo, conclamo, exclamo, clamito, boo, voco, invoco, provoco, revoco, invito, arcesso, offirmo, posco, postulo, oro, exoro, obsecro, precor, impero, iubeo; p. 19, do, reddo, dedo, devoveo, commendo, accipio, recipio, ostendo, placeo, lubet, decet, pareo, sequor, consequor, adnuo, abdo, consono, tinnio, cano, contonat, tumultuor, perstrepo, interpello, saluto, gratulor, plaudo, desero, relinquo, desino. Some of these, without question, primarily denote progressive action, but the majority seem to me clearly to denote acts that primarily are not progressive; and the same is true of the entire list of two hundred and eighty verbs, taken as a whole. Moreover, many of these verbs occur in passages in which the perfect alternates with the historical present in the same passage. In fact, the disparity between the number of perfects and historical presents of the same verb is not great. I open again, at random, as before, and take a number of successive verbs. The first numeral shows the number of historical presents, the second the number of perfects, of each verb occurring in Early Latin: dico, 18, 11; interrogo, 3, 1; respondeo, 3, 4; exclamo, 7, 1; voco, 4, 2; iubeo, 7, 6; increpo, 1, 1; taceo, 1, 1; video, 12, 4; videor, 2, 7; aspicio, 4, 2. (62, 40.) In the main the balance is not so very far from even. A total of seventy-eight verbs used in both tenses shows 239 : 204. Either, then, the author's inference for the present must hold for the perfect, too, or is of no significance for the present.

It is beyond question, I believe, that the use of the historical present in Early Latin has no connection with progressive verbs, — no more than the historical perfect. Further, I do not believe that any verb used in the historical present in Early Latin ordinarily denotes progressive action, whether the verb itself designates an act that is progressive or one that is momentary. To my mind, Rodemeyer, Das Präsens Historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides, is correct when he maintains that the historical present narrates the bare fact of an action which took place in a sphere of time determined as past by the context. In other words, the historical present is aoristic in action. When it is urged that this is inconsistent with the vivid

picturesqueness of the historical present in actual use, I would
observe that this is only apparently so. Each individual historical
present in a series may perfectly well be aoristic, while the series
itself gives us the effect of a moving whole. In other words, the
progression lies in the succession of aoristic acts, not in the acts
individually. An examination of the material gathered in Emery's
dissertation will, I am confident, show that it is unnatural to take
the presents as anything but momentary, and that it is this very
momentariness which is the chief factor in the artistic effect pro-
duced by the use of the historical present. The speaker does *not*
dwell upon the acts as in process, but touches lightly upon each *en
passant*, thus avoiding the tedium and drag on the attention which
would naturally follow the suggestion of a series of acts each repre-
sented as progressive. I have said that the momentariness of the
action was the chief factor in the artistic effect produced by the his-
torical present. This, of course, is supplemented by the simulta-
neous conception that the acts occur in the speaker's present. I
should, therefore, define the historical present as a tense used of a
series of momentary acts belonging to the past, into which the
speaker projects himself. This definition will demand modification
only so far as other tenses occur in combination with the historical
present. As a matter of fact the historical present seldom or never
occurs alone, but only in connection with the imperfect, perfect, his-
torical infinitive, or pluperfect, as will be shown in detail in the
material which follows.

a) The historical present varied with the historical perfect.[1]

In combinations of this kind the perfect is often used to introduce
the narration and to close it, the presents being placed between.
Examples: Truc. 645 ff.

Rus mane dudum hinc ire me iussit pater
Ut bubus glandem prandio depromerem.
Post illoc quam veni, advenit, si dis placet,
Ad villam argentum meo qui debebat patri,
Qui ovis Tarentinas erat mercatus de patre.
Quaerit patrem.   Dico esse in urbe.   Interrogo
Quid eum velit   *   *   *   *   *   *

[1] I follow the classification of material presented in Emery's dissertation.

Homo cruminam sibi de collo detrahit,
Minas viginti mi dat.   Accipio lubens,
Condo in cruminam.   Ille abiit.   Ego * * minas
Ovis in crumina hac in urbem detuli.

In the following, Capt. 478 ff., we have an introductory perfect,
followed by presents, but without concluding perfect:

Nam uti dudum hinc abii, accessi ad adulescentes in foro.
'Salvete,' inquam.   'Quo imus una?' inquam: atque illi tacent.
'Quis ait "hoc" aut quis profitetur?' inquam.   Quasi muti silent,
Neque me rident.   'Ubi cenamus?' inquam.   Atque illi abnuont.
Dico unum ridiculum dictum de dictis melioribus,
Quibus solebam menstrualis epulas ante adipiscier:
Nemo ridet; scivi extemplo rem de conpecto geri.
Ne canem quidem irritatam voluit quisquam imitarier,
Saltem, si non adriderent, dentes ut restringerent.
Abeo ab illis, postquam video me sic ludificarier;
Pergo ad alios, venio ad alios, deinde ad alios: una res!

In Phormio, 862 ff. we have a succession of presents with a perfect
at the close:

Ubi in gynaeceum ire occipio, puer ad me adcurrit Mida,
Pone prendit pallio, resupinat: respicio, rogo
Quam ob rem retineat me: ait esse vetitum intro ad eram accedere.
'Sophrona modo fratrem huc' inquit 'senis introduxit Chremem:'
Eumque nunc esse intus cum illis.   Hoc ubi ego audivi, ad fores
Suspenso gradu placide ire perrexi.

Other characteristic examples of presents varying in one way or
another with perfects are: Aul. 371 ff.; Curc. 329 ff.; Ad. 617 ff.;
And. 353 ff.; Hec. 38 ff.

b) The historical present varied with the imperfect.

This combination is of rare occurrence. The only examples
cited by Emery are Afran. 140, proficiscor: res tempus locus, simul
otium hortabatur; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3; Enn. Ann. 140; 288; Lucil.
296, 5.

c) The historical present varied with the historical perfect and
imperfect.   A characteristic illustration is Capt. 498:

Quid est suavius quam bene rem gerere
Bono publico, sicut ego feci heri, quom
    Emi hosce homines: ubi quisque vident,
Eunt obviam gratulanturque eam rem.
Ita me miserum restitando retinendo lassum reddiderunt:
Vix ex gratulando miser iam eminebam.
Tandem abii ad praetorem ; ibi vix requievi :
Rogo syngraphum: datur mi ilico: dedi Tyndaro: ille abiit domum.
Inde ilico praevortor domum, postquam id actum est;
Ego protinus ad fratrem inde abii, mei ubi sunt alii captivi.
Rogo Philocratem ex Alide ecquis omnium norit:
Tandem hic exclamat eum sibi esse sodalem;
Dico eum esse apud me; hic extemplo orat opsecratque eum sibi
    ut liceat videre:
Iussi ilico hunc exsolvi.

Other examples are Amph. 1061 ff.; Epid. 209 ff.; H. T. 121 ff.;
Eun. 575 ff.; Trag. Incert. 5 ff.; Enn. Ann. 28 ff.; 55 ff.

d) The historical present is varied with the pluperfect. Only
Curc. 644 ff.:

Ea me spectatum tulerat per Dionysia.
Postquam illo ventumst, iam ut me collocaverat,
Exoritur ventus turbo: spectacla ibi ruont:
Ego pertimesco: ibi me nescioquis arripit
Timidam atque pavidam.

e) Historical present varied with the historical perfect and plu-
perfect. This is likewise rare. Most. 486 ff.:

Abimus omnes cubitum, condormivimus.
Lucernam forte oblitus fueram extinguere:
Atque ille exclamat derepente maxumum.
    *   *   *   *   *   *   *   *
Cf. Eun. 629 ff.

f) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the
imperfect, and the pluperfect. Examples: Rud. 37 ff.; Phor. 592 ff.
This combination is infrequent.

g) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the
imperfect, and the historical infinitive, e.g. Amph. 1107 ff.:

> postquam in cunas conditust,
> Devolant angues iubati deorsum inpluvium duo
> Maxumi: continuo extollunt ambo capita
> . . . sed angues oculis omnis circumvisere.
> Postquam pueros conspicati, pergunt ad cunas citi:
> Ego cunas recessim rursum vorsum trahere et ducere,
> Metuens pueris, mihi formidans, tantoque angues acrius
> Persequi.   Postquam conspexit angues ille alter puer,
> Citus e cunis exilit, facit recta in anguis impetum:

Alterum altera prehendit eos manu perniciter.
Cf. also Amph. 203 ff.; Merc. 42 ff.; Eun. 397 ff.; And. 51 ff.

h) The historical present is varied with the historical perfect, the imperfect, the pluperfect, and the historical infinitive, e.g. Phor. 71 ff.; Hec. 114 ff.

An examination of the foregoing material along with the other citations in Emery reveals to me no essential difference between the use of the historical present and the historical perfect, except that in the main the present seems to give the effect of greater vividness. In general, I assent to the verdict of Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, p. 103, who says that the historical present alternates arbitrarily with the perfect. This alternation was doubtless practiced for the sake of giving variety to long descriptive or narrative passages. But I doubt whether, if in a given instance, the presents were changed to perfects and the perfects to presents, any canon of usage would be violated, or whether any difference of force (barring the greater vividness of the present) would be recognizable.

Brugmann (Kurze Vergl. Gramm., p. 572) recognizes also a Praesens Tabulare, e.g. CIL, i, 30, Scipio Cisauna Samnio cepit, subigit omne Loucanam opsidesque abdoucit. This usage originated in inscriptional records, and is obviously related to the historical present.

3. **The present indicative with** *iam, iam dudum, quam dudum, iam pridem, iam diu, modo.*[1]   Here the present is equivalent to the present perfect.

a) With *iam dudum:* As. 741, iam dudum est intus; Bacch. 109, iam dudum tacitus te sequor; 890, iam dudum hercle equidem sen-

---

[1] See Langen, Beiträge zum Plautus, 1881, p. 41 f.

tio; Cas. 368, iam dudum hercle fabulor; 414; 540; 803 ; Cist. 508,
scis iam dudum omnem meam sententiam; Merc. 138, iam dudum
sputo sanguinem ; 556; 617 ; M. G. 580, iam dudum scio; 1301; 1398 ;
Rud. 1030, ecquid condicionis audes ferre ? : : iam dudum fero; Poen.
12, iam dudum exspecto; 1161; Pseud. 1215, mihi iam dudum ille
Surus cor perfrigefacit; Stich. 344, iam dudum ego istum patior
dicere iniuste mihi; Trin. 812; 1000; H. T. 409, iam dudum exspec-
tat; 882, quid illic iam dudum cessat? Eun. 448, iam dudum te
amat; iam dudum facile fit quod doleat; 743; 816; 917; Phor. 289,
iam dudum audio; 471, nos iam dudum accusamus; Hec. 336, iam
dudum audio hic tumultuari; Ad. 720, te iam dudum quaero; Enn.
Trag. 34, iam dudum animus atque aures avent;   Afran. 197, studeo
iam dudum; Acc. 682, iam dudum exsulo; Stat. 13, iam dudum
depopulat macellum; Turp. 24, iam dudum audio. *Dudum* alone,
M. G. 406, dudum edepol planumst id quidem.

   b) With *quam dudum,* Stich. 528, quam dudum in portum venis ?
310.

   c) With *iam diu,* Pseud. 233, iam diu ego huic bene et hic mihi
volumus; 261, iam diu scio qui fuit; Ad. 931, iam diu non potest.

   d) With *modo,* Hec. 458, advenis modo.

   e) With *iam,* Most. 79, triennium iam hinc abest; 589, multos me
iam dies frustramini ; 954, sex menses iam hic nemo habitat.

   f) With *iam pridem:* Pseud. 466, iam pridem tu me spernis;
Rud. 963, novi iam pridem.

   4. The present used as future[1] (apart from the use in deliberative
questions, for which see below, p. 22). Instances of this usage are
frequent in Early Latin. Its origin is usually referred to the achro-
nistic use of the present indicative; see p. 10. Following Sjögren, I
group the material according to A. Positive declarative sentences;
B. Negative declarative sentences; C. Questions.

A. Positive Declarative Sentences.

   a) In expressions of the type : ' I'll be back immediately.'
   1) Regularly in the verb *redire,* e.g. M. G. 1020, iam ad te redeo ;
so Merc. 963; Pseud. 1157; Stich. 523; Ad. 757, post huc redeo.

   [1] See especially Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, 1906,
p. 6 ff. This supersedes all previous discussions of the subject. But see also Blase,

These are in dialogue. In soliloquy we find Cist. 704, redeo intro;
M. G. 592, redeo in senatum rusum; Rud. 904. The future of *redire*
is found only Amph. 530 (a soothing assurance) and Capt. 497.

2) *Reverti*, on the other hand, occurs only in the future, e.g. Pseud.
1159; And. 485 (E, Don, *revortor*); Sjögren, p. 7 f.

3) *Revenire* occurs only in the future perfect (with future force;
see below under the Future Perfect), Bacch. 1066; M. G. 863. So
Truc. 547, mox huc venero.

4) The future is regular with *esse, adesse* (Sjögren, p. 9). Con-
tinuo hic adero, H. T. 502, is the Mss. reading, but was changed to
adsum by Bentley, who is followed by modern editors.

5) In other expressions of this type. The present is found As.
379, iam ego recurro huc; Bacch. 794, 1052, iam exeo ad te; Eun.
493, post huc continuo exeo; Stich. 623, poste ad te continuo transeo;
535; Cas. 145. But the future is used of an act to be consummated
less immediately, e.g. Stich. 614, non metuo; per hortum transibo;
so Capt. 457.

b) *Abire.* The present of this occurs with future force some 40
times in dialogue, e.g. Bacch. 902, abeo ad forum igitur. Once in
soliloquy, Epid. 665, abeo intro. The future: Cas. 962, quasi non
audiam abibo.

c) Expressions with the force: ' I'll approach,' ' I'll accost.' Bacch.
980, quid quod te misi? ecquid egisti? :: rogas? congredere! :: gra-
dior. But when a speaker merely expresses a resolve to accost
another, the future is regular, e.g. Rud. 309, sed quos perconter
video; adibo.

d) The simple *ire.*

1) The present of this referring to the immediate future is com-
mon in dialogue, e.g. Poen. 190, ego in aedem Veneris eo; so Asin.
108; Cas. 715; Merc. 385; Rud. 403; Eun. 580; Hec. 273; and fre-
quently elsewhere.

2) The future also is frequent in the same sense of the immediate
future, e.g. Bacch. 1060, ego ad forum autem hinc ibo; Cas. 526;
Eun. 921; H. T. 173; Ad. 632; and frequently.

3) The future is naturally used of acts to take place in the less

Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, p. 108 ff. ; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino,
1888, p. 39 ff.

immediate future, e.g. Most. 1131, quin venis? : : promitte, ego ibo pro te; Merc. 222; and elsewhere.

e) Other verbs of motion.

1) *Sequi.* Following a command or exhortation, *sequor* occurs some thirty times, *e.g.* Poen. 502, sequere hac! : : sequor.

2) But the future is used to indicate that one will follow soon, e.g. Men. 431, eamus intro. : : iam sequar te; Amph. 544; so Cist. 773; and probably regularly in such context.

3) Other verbs: H. T. 1000, quid hoc autem? senex exit foras: ego fugio; Hec. 513, porto hoc iurgium ad uxorem ... atque evomam; Amph. 1143, ego in caelum migro.

4) In And. 957, proviso quid agat Pamphilus. atque eccum, we probably have a genuine present, 'I am on my way to see.' Expressions of this sort occur frequently where the purpose of the dramatist is to acquaint the audience through one of the performers with the dramatic situation. Other examples of the same kind are: Eun. 1005; H. T. 1046; Most. 880; Poen. 847; Merc. 804; And. 414; Eun. 923; Ad. 549.

f) In so-called rhetorical presents and equivalent perfects.

1) In expressions of the type *perii, actum est.* These are usually accompanied by a protasis. Examples: Asin. 287, perii, nisi Libanum invenio iam; Capt. 749, peristis, nisi iam hunc abducitis; so Asin. 243; Cist. 671; M. G. 828; Asin. 918, nam ni impetro, regem perdidi; Rud. 683, nisi quid re praesidi apparas, acta haec res est; and frequently.

2) Presents: e.g. Phor. 179, nullus es, nisi iam aliquod tibi consilium celere reperis; Most. 539, manufesta res est, nisi quid occurro prius; H. T. 672, triumpho, si licet me latere tecto abscedere; Poen. 671, rex sum, si ego illum hodie ad med adlexero; Trin. 561, nam qui vivamus nil est, si illum amiserit; Rud. 168, salvae sunt, si illos fluctus devitaverint; Asin. 244; Capt. 539; Epid. 82; Stat. 46.

g) In some miscellaneous expressions: Bacch. 886, et ego te et ille mactamus infortunio; Stich. 453, ego hunc lacero diem; 612, ibisne ad cenam foras? : : apud fratrem ceno; 415; Most. 827, satis boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice; Pseud. 60, proxuma Dionysia. : : cras ea quidem sunt; Eun. 338, 'scin quid ego te volebam?' "dic." 'cras est mihi iudicium.' Atta, 9, cras est communis dies; Cas. 447, pro-

tollo mortem mihi; And. 594, domum ibo atque huc renuntio; 732, sponsae pater intervenit; repudio consilium; Aul. 400; Trin. 815; H. T. 804; 1002; Bacch. 364; Asin. 114.

B. Negative Sentences.

There is noticeable a distinct tendency in Early Latin to use the present in negative expressions, where the corresponding affirmative expression takes the future, especially in expressions indicating an unwillingness to comply with some suggestion or request ('resistance to pressure'). Thus, corresponding to the affirmative futures, *audiam, dabo, dicam, faciam, pergam,* etc., we find the present in Phor. 486, audi, obsecro. :: non audio; Rud. 946; Phor. 388, (dic nomen. ::) non dico; 669, nil do; Most. 261, tum tu igitur cedo purpurissum. :: non do; Cas. 231, mane! :: non maneo; 373, gratiam facias! :: neque facio nec censeo; Men. 150, perge! :: non pergo hercle; Amph. 449, non illi obtempero; As. 480, in ius te voco. :: non eo; Cas. 149; Rud. 1371; Trin. 1059; and in the 3d person, Bacch. 592, non it; negat se ituram; Stich. 608; And. 371. But where the will of the speaker sinks into the background, the future is employed, e.g. Most. 1070, non ego illi extemplo hamum ostendam; cf. And. 396; Rud. 959. *Posse,* also, referring to the future, when accompanied by a negative, has a fondness for the present, e.g. Ep. 84, nisi suffulcis firmiter, non potes subsistere; H. T. 679, nulla mihi res posthac potest iam intervenire; Gracchus (Meyer, p. 230), si repudiaritis, non potest quin.

C. Questions.

Questions referring to the future occasionally take the present indicative.

a) With *quam mox* the present is regularly employed, e.g. Truc. 207, quam mox te huc recipis? :: iam hic ero; Asin. 449, quam mox mi operam das? Cas. 742, quam mox recreas me? Pseud. 1166; Rud. 1227, quam mox licet te compellare? 1412, quam mox mi argentum redditur? Stich. 533, quam mox coctast cena? Rud. 342. The future is never found with *quam mox* in Early Latin.

b) In double questions, Aul. 660, abin annon? Capt. 846, iuben annon iubes astitui aulas? Curc. 566, reddin annon virginem? M. G. 449, mittis me annon mittis? Pers. 533, tacen annon taces? Pseud.

1246, pedes, statis annon? Rud. 1399, tacen annon? Truc. 755, redin annon redis? 825, dicin annon? And. 186, hocine agis annon? Rodenbusch, op. cit. p. 41, states that in double questions referring to the future the present alone is used.

c) Other expressions: Aul. 289, quoius ducit filiam? 255, quid nunc? etiam mihi despondes filiam? Asin. 480, non eo.::non is? 712, datisne argentum? Bacch. 911, satin est, si plura ex me audiet? Pseud. 874, quanti istuc unum me coquinare perdoces? 1139, ecquis hoc aperit? Truc. 255, ecquis intus exit? 359, hicine hodie cenas? And. 301, daturne illa Pamphilo hodie nuptum? 321, hodie uxorem ducis? H. T. 611, quid agis?

Except in questions, it will be noted that the use of the present as a future is limited almost exclusively to the first person singular. This is entirely natural, as the speaker is perfectly well aware of his own volition, but is not competent to assert the volition of a second or third person. In questions, for the same reasons, the second person is the rule, since these inquire after the volition of the person addressed. In other words it is the volitional element apparently which develops secondarily the future force.

5. Present indicative in deliberative questions.[1] In this discussion of the indicative in deliberative questions I use the term 'deliberative' not in the exact sense, but as conveying an inquiry after a command, or, perhaps more accurately, an inquiry after advice; cf. under the deliberative subjunctive, p. 178. Sjögren, p. 81 ff., uses the term "konsultative Fragen." Sjögren's exhaustive discussion of these questions establishes conclusively that they are questions asking for advice, and that they never (or very rarely) cover any of the other varieties of the numerous subjunctive uses ordinarily grouped under the name "deliberative," such as questions expressing despair, true deliberatives, subjunctives of duty or fitness, repudiating questions. In this he differs from Deane, who (Proceedings Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxi, p. xxxiii ff.) expresses the opinion that there is no difference between

---

[1] Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, p. 81 ff.; Mad-vig, Opuscula Academica, ii, p. 40 ff.; Deane, Deliberative Questions in Terence, Proceedings Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxi, p. xxxiii ff.; Neumann, De futuri usu, 1888, 16 ff.; Morris, Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence, Am. Jour. Phil. x, p. 397 ff.; xi, p. 16 ff.; Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 133 ff.

the indicative and subjunctive in these questions. But as Sjögren demonstrates, *quid agam* is used only in soliloquy in true deliberatives, or else in dialogue in questions of helplessness or despair, whereas *quid ago* (barring Phor. 736) is not used in soliloquy at all, and in dialogue is confined to questions asking for advice. Examples:

a) Questions with *iamne* or *iam :* Men. 176, iam fores ferio ? : : feri; vel mane etiam ; M. G. 1400, iamne in hominem involo ? : : immo etiam prius verberetur; Cas. 503; Curc. 132; Eun. 814; Stat. 35. Plural: Eun. 492, iamne imus?

b) After *quam mox :* M. G. 1406, quam mox seco? Bacch. 775; 880; Men. 153. Plural: Eun. 788, quam mox irruimus ?

c) Questions introduced by particles (usually *-ne*) or pronouns: Bacch. 1196, quid ago? So Epid. 693; Pers. 666; Phor. 447 ; H. T. 343; Trin. 1062. Plural: M. G. 250, quid agimus? So Men. 844; Pseud. 1160; Eun. 1081; 1088; Phor. 1007; Ad. 538; in the form quid nunc agimus, Pseud. 722; Epid. 157; Eun. 811; Asin. 755, addone ? : : adde; Bacch. 1168, etiam redditis? an ego experior tecum vim maiorem ? Capt. 479 ff., quo imus ad prandium ? ubi cenamus ? Cas. 405, compressan palma an porrecta ferio ? 977 ; Epid. 143, quo a tarpezita peto? Men. 231, an quasi mare omnis circumimus insulas ? 320, satin obsonatumst, an obsono amplius? M. G. 1036, vocon ergo hanc quae te quaerit? 1424, verberon etiam an mittis? Most. 774, eon? voco huc hominem ? Stich. 531, hodiene exoneramus navem? 750, utrubi accumbo? And. 315, adeon ad eum ? Eun. 434, purgon ego me ?

d) Without introductory pronoun or particle, Poen. 1224, pergo (*perge,* codd) etiam temptare? Plural: M. G. 613, gerimus rem? Phor. 812, hanc igitur mittimus?

e) All of the foregoing examples are in the 1st person. One or two instances of the 3d person also occur: Cist. 768, quid fit? So Pseud. 1159; Rud. 687, unde iste animus mi invenitur ?

The foregoing material, which is fairly complete for Early Latin, shows clearly that the present indicative in "deliberative" questions is confined to dialogue. The only exception is Phor. 736, quid ago? adeo, maneo? which occurs in soliloquy.

As already stated, the usage is almost exclusively restricted to questions asking for advice. The only exceptions I have noted are:

Amph. 391, dic, non nocebo. : : tuae fide credo! So Cas. 1007; And. 497, credon tibi hoc nunc, peperisse hanc e Pamphilo! All of these seem to have repudiating force (see p. 186).

A difference of opinion exists in regard to the interpretation of passages like the following: Merc. 130, at etiam asto? at etiam cesso foribus facere hisce assulas? Rud. 677, cesso ego illas consolari? Capt. 827; Cas. 237; 723; Epid. 342; M. G. 896; Pers. 197; Truc. 630. All of these contain *cesso* with a following infinitive and occur in soliloquy. Most editors take these expressions as interrogative. By this interpretation they are true deliberatives, thus forming an exception to Sjögren's principle that the present indicative is not employed in true deliberative questions. Others regard the expressions with *cesso* just cited as declarative, not interrogative. This is Lindsay's view.

6. Present indicative in questions having the force of the imperative, hortatory subjunctive, etc.[1] These questions are introduced by *quin, etiam, non, -ne.*

a) Imperative questions introduced by *quin :* Amph. 775, quin tu istanc iubes circumferri; 918, quin huc adducis? Asin. 30, quin tu ergo rogas? 325; 380; 597; 659; 661; 850; 868; Bacch. 245, quin tu reddis? 861; Capt. 592, quin fugis? 636; Cas. 599, quin tu suspendis te? 100; 903; Curc. 84, quin tu taces? The same phrase also Men. 561; 1114; Merc. 494; Curc. 94, quin das savium? 183; 611, quin tu is in malam crucem? The same phrase also Men. 915; Rud. 518; Epid. 303, quin tu is intro? 479; 615; 685; Men. 382, quin, amabo, is intro? 639, quin dicis? The same phrase also Merc. 724; M. G. 1183; Pers. 144; Men. 660, quin refers pallam domum? 747, quin respicis? 912, quin tu te suspendis? Merc. 174, quin tu expedis? 778, quin abis? The same phrase also M. G. 1085, 1087; Poen. 608; Merc. 915, quin intro ducis me? 929; 942; 951; M. G. 446, quin retines altrinsecus? 751, quin tu istanc orationem amoves? 1067; 1387; Most. 343, quin, amabo, accubas? 572; 1131; Pers. 397, quin tu me ducis? 424; 437; 625; Poen. 373, quin adire sinis? 972; Pseud. 40, quin legis? 241, quin revocas? 350; 638; 713; 880; 891; 1147; Rud. 122, quin tu in paludem is? Stich. 479, quin tu promit-

---

[1] Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativs bei Plautus, 1871, p. 23 f. ; Stahl, De natura atque usu imperativi apud Terentium, 1886, p. 35 f.

tis? 716, quin bibis? Trin. 502, quin fabulare? 802; 1026; And. 399, quin taces? H. T. 832, quin accipis? Ph. 429, quin quod est ferundum fers? Examples of the 2d plural: Cas. 765, quin agitis? quin datis? Men. 1000, quin me mittitis? Merc. 932, quin, pedes, vos in curriculum conicitis? Stich. 138, quin vos capitis condicionem?

b) Questions introduced by *etiam*. The few instances of this formula all seem to involve impatience: Asin. 714, etiam tu istunc amoves? Curc. 41, etiam taces? So also Pers. 152; Trin. 514; 790; Curc. 189, etiam dispertimini? Most. 383, etiam vigilas? 937, etiamne aperis? Pers. 275, scelerate, etiam respicis? 413; 542; Poen. 431; H. T. 235, etiam caves? Phor. 542, etiam tu hinc abis? Ad. 550, etiam taces?

c) Questions introduced by *non*: Amph. 700, non taces? So also Asin. 931; Bacch. 470; 627; Curc. 712; Men. 1026; Merc. 211; 484; 754; Most. 734; Asin. 476, non audes mihi subvenire? Men. 516, non tu abis? So also Merc. 757; Pseud. 1196; Stich. 603; M. G. 318, non iubes? And. 743, non mihi respondes? H. T. 919, non tu te cohibes? non te respicis? Phor. 987, non taces? so also 1004; 849, non manes? Ad. 781, non manum abstines? Plural: Ad. 942, non omittitis?

d) Questions introduced by *-ne*: Amph. 518, abin e conspectu meo? Similarly 857; Aul. 660; Bacch. 1168; 1176; Cas. 302; Merc. 756; Most. 850; Pers. 671; Trin. 457; 989; Asin. 939, iuben hanc abscedere? M. G. 315; Most. 660, dicisne? Pers. 412, accipin argentum? 792; And. 317, abin in malam rem? 337, fugin hinc? Eun. 651, in hinc? 861? Plural: Curc. 311, datin isti sellam? properatin ocius? Truc. 631, datin soleas? atque me intro actutum ducite!

In most of the examples in the foregoing categories, the present indicative refers to future time. These examples, therefore, might have been classified under the use of the present for the future. But their imperative equivalence seemed to call for the separate classification here given.

e) Without particle, Trag. incert. 34, itis, paratis?

Questions equivalent to the hortatory subjunctive, etc.:

a) In self-exhortations, Asin. 291, quin ego iubeo? Aul. 816, quin dico? Merc. 910, quin ornatum hunc reicio? Rud. 586, quin abeo in Veneris fanum? Phor. 209, quin abeo?

b) Hortatory, Asin. 680, quin ad hunc adgredimur? Cas. 854, quin imus ergo? Men. 247, quin domum redimus? Merc. 582, quin ergo imus atque obsonium curamus? 773, quin abimus? Pseud. 1048.

c) Jussive, Curc. 251, quin depromuntur quae opus sunt?

7. The conative present. Instances of this probably do not occur in Early Latin, though Capt. 232, quod volunt, dum id impetrant, boni sunt, is sometimes cited as an example of the usage.

THE IMPERFECT INDICATIVE.[1]

The Indo-European imperfect indicative transferred to the past the kind of action denoted by the present from which it was formed. Some present formations designated progressive action; others momentary (aoristic) action; cf. p. 10. Hence some imperfects designated progressive action in past time; others denoted momentary action in the past, and were equivalent to aorists. Examples of these last are seen in the Greek ἔφη, ἴσαν, ἴτην, ἐνεόμην; Brugmann, Gr. Gramm.[3], p. 487.

The imperfect indicative formation of Indo-European has disappeared in Latin and has been supplanted by a new imperfect in -bam (an aorist formation — bhu̯ām — from the root bhe̯u-), which, however, seems to have inherited the functions of the Indo-European imperfect. In Latin accordingly we find imperfect indicatives of both types: progressive and aoristic. Of these two general values, the progressive is by far the more prevalent. From it also have developed other functions, — particularly the customary and iterative uses.

CLASSIFICATION OF IMPERFECT USES.[2]

1. The imperfect indicative represents an action as in process, as going on, in past time (Progressive imperfect). Examples: Amph. 199, (quom pugnabant maxume) ego tum fugiebam maxume; 251;

---

[1] Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 145 ff.; Wheeler, The Imperfect Indicative in Early Latin, Am. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 163 ff.; The Syntax of the Imperfect Indicative in Early Latin, Classical Philology, i, p. 357 ff.; Blase, Studien und Kritiken zur lat. Syntax, 1904, p. 1 ff.; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino, 1888, p. 8 ff.; Wimmerer, Zum Indikativ im Hauptsatz irrealer Bedingungsperioden, Wiener Studien, xxvii, p. 260 ff.; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 485 f.; Delbrück, Vergl Synt. ii, p. 268; 302–6; 310–14; Brugmann, Kurze Vergl. Gramm., p. 573 f.

[2] I am greatly indebted to the very complete collection of examples contained in the paper of Wheeler in Classical Philology, i, p. 380 ff. My treatment also, in the

603, prius multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adveneram; 1067, ardere censui aedis; ita tum confulgebant; so 1096; Aul. 427, in aedibus quid tibi erat negoti ('what were you doing?'); 550, pol ego te ut accusem merito meditabar; 625, semul radebat pedibus terram et croccibat; 827, iam ut eriperes apparabas; so also Epid. 409; And, 656; Aul. 706, me coulocavi in arborem indeque exspectabam; so also Poen. 1391; And. 435; And. Alt. Ex. 1; Eun. 743; Enn. Ann. 55. 12; Bacch. 286, is nostrae navi lembus insidias dabat; 297; 983, lacrimans tacitus auscultabat; Capt. 491, alii parasiti obambulabant in foro; 913, illum formidabam; ita frendebat dentibus; Cas. 178, ibam ad te; so also Cas. 593, ad te hercle ibam commodum; Epid. 218, et cum ea tibicinae ibant quattuor; Enn. Sota, 534; Lucil. 382; Cas. 432, ut trepidabat! ut festinabat! 433, ut sussultabat! 577, quid agis? :: te ecastor praestolabar; so also Epid. 221; Cist. 566, iam perducebam illam ad me suadela mea; 723, quid quaeritabas? Epid. 214, obviam occurrebant suis amatoribus; 215, eos captabant; 216, sub vestimentis habebant retia; so also Merc. 360, nequiquam abstrusam habebam; Pseud. 676; Naev. Trag. 54; Lucil. 4; Epid. 482, hanc filius meus deperibat; Men. 29, Tarenti ludi forte erant quom illuc venit; 419, tibi advorsabar; Men. 1053, tu clamabas deum fidem; 1116, nam tunc dentes mihi cadebant primulum; 563, pallam ad phrygionem ferebat; Merc. 43, res ad illam abibat; 45; M. G. 100, is amabat meretricem; so also And. 88; Hec. 114; M. G. 1336, temptabam spirarent annon; Most. 961, quis istaec faciebat? Poen. 1179, omnis odor complebat; Pseud. 800, cur sedebas? so also Rud. 846; Cato, Jord. p. 36, 2; Calp. Piso, Peter, p. 84, 5; Rud. 519, eas res agebam commodum; 543, iam postulabas te totam Siciliam devoraturum; cf. Stich. 559; Rud. 1123, dudum dimidiam petebas partem; Stich. 328, quid me velles visebam; 365, commodum sese sol superabat; Trin. 212, omnes mortales hunc aiebant Calliclem indignum civitate hac esse; 901, ubi ipse erat? :: bene rem gerebat; 910, atque modo vorsabatur mihi in labris; 926, quid ille mihi latitabat? 1100, thensaurum ecfodiebam; Truc. 197, nam lavabat; Plaut. Frag. 82, tunc

main, follows Wheeler's; but I have omitted in this connection all consideration of the imperfect indicative in dependent clauses. A careful examination of the material showed that subordinate clauses exhibit no uses not exemplified in independent sentences. Full material illustrative of the use of the imperfect in dependent sentences is given below in the chapter on "The Indicative in Subordinate Clauses."

papillae primulum fraterculabant — illud volui dicere: sororiabant;
And. 108, curabat una funus; 533, te ipsum quaerebam; so also H. T.
844; Eun. 1065; Phor. 472; Ad. 461; H. T. 126, pro se quisque
sedulo faciebant; 292, anus subtemen nebat; praeterea una ancillula
erat; ea texebat; 366, haec arte tractabat virum; 758, te mi ipsum
iam dudum optabam dari; 781; 907, Clinia haec fieri videbat; Eun.
86, quis hic loquitur? tun hic eras? quid stabas hic? so also Ad.
901, tu hic eras? Eun. 323, id stomachabar modo; 378, quid agis?
iocabar; 620, id faciebat retinendi illius causa; 1000, iam diu ali-
quam causam quaerebat; Phor. 52, ego obviam conabar tibi; 573,
quid illi tam diu commorabare? 614, id cum hoc agebam commo-
dum; Hec. 294; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3, 2, in auream molabat victimam
pulchram; 4, 2, noctu Troiade exibant; so 5, 3; Com. 114, tantum
ibi molae crepitum faciebant, tintinnabant compedes; Enn. Ann. 28,
9, semita nulla viam stabilibat; 55, 8, certabant, urbem Romam
vocarent; 93, 1, mandebat homonem: heu! quam crudeli condebat
membra sepulcro! 107, aquila volabat; 140, 4, omne arbustum sona-
bat fremitu; 320, iam cata signa fera e sonitum dare voce parabant;
321, olli cernebant magnis de rebus; 351, navibus explebant sese
terrasque replebant; 359, cum saevo obsidio magnus Titanus preme-
bat; 400, ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni; 437, Massili- porta-
bant iuvenes ad litora -tanas; Enn. Trag. 9, ita magni fluctus
eiciebantur; 107, his erat in ore Bromius, his Bacchus pater; 110,
ignotus iuvenum coetus alterna vice inibat: 396, cubitis pinsibant
humum; Acc. 34, fulmen, flammam ostentabat; Trag. Incert. Ribb.
p. 273, 7, Priamus ecsacrificabat hostiis; p. 282, 3, trepidus hortabar
fugam; Turp. 58, sperabam consilia nostra dividiae tibi non fore;
147, misero mihi mitigabat sandalio caput; Afran. 140, res tempus
locus simul otium hortabatur; 151, quod vitae studium mihi suppo-
nebas? Com. Incert. Ribb. 32, sibi cum tetulit coronam, tibi ferebat;
Lucil. 80, mantica cantheri costas gravitate premebat; 112, 1, ex-
spirans animam pulmonibus aeger agebat; 127, 2, illum sumina
ducebant; 171, ante fores quidam grandaevos gemebat; 186, circum
impluvium ciner pluebat; 294, Scipiadae magno improbus obiciebat
Asellus; 519, di reditum talem portendebant; 749, hoc pretium atque
reddebamus honorem; Cass. Hem. Peter, p. 72, 29, mulier cantabat
et cymbalissabat; C. Gracchus, Meyer, p. 234, is in lectica ferebatur.

2. The imperfect often denotes, not an act in process, but a continuing state or condition. This use is closely connected with that already considered and is obviously but another phase of it. Thus certain verbs by their very nature are incapable of indicating an act as in process. Verbs like 'walk,' 'run,' 'sigh,' 'rain,' 'show,' 'fight,' etc. easily lend themselves to the idea of progression; but verbs like 'know,' 'believe,' 'fear,' etc. do not naturally denote an act going on; they denote rather a continuous state, — an act that endures rather than progresses. Such verbs stand frequently in the imperfect in Latin where in English we more commonly use the simple past. Examples:

a) *scibam, nescibam,* Amph. 22, etsi pro imperio vobis quod dictum foret scibat facturos; 385, scibam nullum esse nobis nisi me servom Sosiam; As. 300; Aul. 754; Bacch. 676; Poen. 509; Pseud. 499; 500; 501; Trin. 657; H. T. 309; Eun. 113; 155; 736; 1004; Phor. 529; 582; Acc. 37; Ribb. Trag. p. 285, 87; Turp. 16; Cass. Hem. Peter, p. 70, 7; cf. Eun. 1089, isti te ignorabant.

b) *censebam:* Aul. 667, Fide censebam maxumam multo fidem esse; As. 385; Bacch. 342, censebam me ecfugisse a vita marituma: Men. 605; 636; 1072; 1136; Merc. 196; 815; Pers. 171; 415.

c) *putabam:* And. 91, spectatum satis putabam; 113; cf. Amph. 1095, aedis primo ruere rebamur; And. 110, sic cogitabam.

d) *credebam:* Amph. 597, neque credebam primo mihimet Sosiae; Merc. 212; Pers. 477; Rud. 1186; H. T. 785; Hec. 713; Ad. 693.

e) *videbar:* Enn. Epich. 499, nam videbar somniare me lecto esse mortuom; Ann. 28, 7; Turp. 151.

f) Other verbs: Asin. 315, ego mirabar; so Phor. 490; Ad. 642; And. 175; Peter 73, 27; Asin. 392, quid quaeritas? :: Demaenetum volebam; so 395; 452; Lucil. 313; Bacch. 190; Most. 9; Trin. 195; Aul. 178, praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire; Phor. 117, illam ducere cupiebat et metuebat absentem patrem; Men. 420; Truc. 185; Eun. 433; 514, ita tum erat suspicio; Bacch. 683, Bacchidem suspicabar; Capt. 662, non occatorem dicere audebas? Cas. 674, peccavi: illuc dicere volebam; 702; Epid. 138, desipiebam mentis, quom illa scripta mittebam; Merc. 247, quo magis cura cruciabar; And. 60, gaudebam; Ad. 152; Eun. 587; And. 96, id mihi placebat; Stich. 329, me quidem harum miserebat; Acc. 355; Eun. 1013, an paeni-

tebat flagiti? Hec. 806, denique hercle iam pudebat; Ad. 274; 150,
iam omnium taedebat; Phor. 642, a primo insanibat; Hec. 177,
primos dies bene conveniebat inter eas; 651, hunc videre optabamus
diem; Phor. 83, serviebat lenoni; Bacch. 959, iam duo restabant
fata tunc; Phor. 85; Bacch. 12, Praenestinum opino esse, ita glo-
riosus erat; And. 62, sic vita erat.

  3. **The imperfect is frequently used to denote a customary action**
(Customary Imperfect).   This use apparently develops from the
progressive function of the imperfect.   An act that goes on perma-
nently tends to become habitual.   Examples: As. 142, sordido vitam
oblectabas pane;   143, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias;   207,
tum mihi aedes quoque adridebant, quom ad te veniebam;   209, in
meo ore usque eratis, meo de studio studia erant vostra omnia, usque
adhaerebatis . . . quod volueram faciebatis, quod volebam fugie-
batis . . . neque conari id facere audebatis;   889, ille suppilabat me,
quod ancillas suspicabar; Bacch. 421, eademne erat disciplina tibi,
quom tu adulescens eras?   426 f.; 429; 438;   Cist. 18, raro dabat
quod biberem, id merum infuscabat; Epid. 135, illam amabam olim;
587, cur me patrem vocabas? Men. 717, omnia mala ingerebat quem-
quam aspexerat;   1122, uno nomine ambo eratis? : : minime, nam
mihi hoc erat quod nunc est, Menaechmo; illum tum vocabant So-
siclem; M. G. 61, rogitabant: "hicine Achilles est?" 835, nam nimis
calebat, amburebat gutturem;   849, mihi imperabat, ego promebam;
850; 854, ea saepe deciens complebatur; 856; Most. 153, victitabam
volup;   discipulinae aliis eram, optumi quisque expetebant a me
doctrinam sibi; 731, immo vita antehac erat; Pers. 649, servi
liberique amabant; Pseud. 1171, ego eram domi imperator summus;
1181; Trin. 503, ubi usus nil erat dicto 'spondeo' dicebat; Plautus,
Fr. 24, nam me puero venter erat solarium; And. 58, horum nil
studebat; 74, primo haec pudice vitam agebat; 83 ff.; 107; 109;
H. T. 102, cottidie accusabam ; 110, non amori operam dabam; 988;
Eun. 118, sororem plerique esse credebant meam; 397, vel rex
semper maxumas mihi agebat, quidquid feceram; 407; Phor. 87,
nos otiosi operam dabamus Phaedriae; 363, ruri fere se continebat;
ibi agrum colendum habebat; saepe mihi narrabat; 789; Hec. 60,
vel hic Pamphilus iurabat quotiens! 157; 426, olim te causae impel-
lebant leves; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 2, virum bonum quom laudabant, ita

laudabant; 3, amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur; fr.
Jord. p. 29, 3, mulieres nostrae capillum cinere unctitabant; p. 35, 1,
interea unamquamque turmam temptabam; quid facere possent spec-
tabam; si quis strenue fecerat, donabam honeste, atque in contione
laudabam; 39, 8, quom Romam veniebant, prorsus devortebantur ad
amicos; p. 64, 2; p. 82, 10; 11; p. 83, 2; 3; Enn. Ann. 191, noe-
num rumores ponebat ante salutem; Trag. 370; Ambr. 495; Turp.
21; Lucil. 691, 'calix' per castra cluebat; CIL, i, 1011, ille meo
officio adsiduo florebat ad omnis; Calp. Piso, p. 83, 29 (Peter), Fla-
vius scriptum faciebat; Asellio, p. 109, 9 (Peter), annales libri tan-
tum modo ea demonstrabant; 110, 17; Rutil. Rufus, p. 123, 23
(Peter); Junius Pennus, p. 226 (Meyer), antea trossulos vocabant;
C. Gracchus, p. 229, 3 (Meyer).

The prevalence of the customary usage leads also to the employ-
ment of the imperfect in the expressions, *solebam* and *mos erat*, Epid.
99, antehac aliis solebas dare consilia mutua; Phor. 89; Carbo,
p. 282 (Meyer); Cato, fr. (Jord.), 83, 1, vestiri in foro honeste mos
erat. Here the 'Aktionsart' is aoristic; it is illogical to speak of a
custom as being customary.

**4. The imperfect at times is used to denote an act that is persisted
in by its author.** This usage exhibits two or three different phases.
Thus:

a) The idea may be that an act is kept up uninterruptedly, as
Capt. 654, illic servom se adsimulabat, 'kept pretending'; Epid. 238,
dissimulabam earum operam sermoni dare, 'kept pretending not to
notice'; 420, ego med sic adsimulabam; quasi stolidum me facie-
bam; M. G. 463, sed quo modo dissimulabat! 'how capitally she
kept up the pretence!' Pseud. 421.

b) The idea may be that an act is repeated (often insistently and
vigorously) at frequent intervals within a short space of time (Itera-
tive Imperfect). Some see in this use a resemblance to the custom-
ary imperfect, but the likeness is only superficial, for the customary
imperfect always covers a long range of time, and denotes a fixed
habit of daily life, whereas the iterative imperfect is limited to a
brief period, and does not denote an habitual practice. Examples:
As. 931, dissuadebam, 'I kept urging him not to;' so 938, dicebam,
pater, tibi ne matri consuleres male, 'I kept telling you, Father, not

to, etc. ; ' Capt. 917, coquom percontabatur possentne seriae fervescere; Epid. 58, ad me ab legione epistulas mittebat; 239, nec satis exaudi- bam, nec sermonis fallebar tamen.   To understand the true character of this passage, it will help to give another of similar meaning, but affirmative in form, since the idiom probably arose in positive sen- tences, and the negative disguises its real nature.   The Epid. passage I conceive to be modelled on something like, amicus meus omnia exaudibat, ego autem sermonis fallebar, in the sense, ' my friend kept hearing everything that was said, but I kept missing snatches of the talk ; ' the passage under discussion is simply a negative ex- ample of the idiom.   Men. 483, mulier quidquid dixerat, idem ego dicebam ; Merc. 216, quin quidque ut dicebam, mihi credebat; so 217; 631, promittebas te os sublinere meo patri; M. G. 1410, ita ancilla dicebat mihi ; Poen. 478, eo praesternebant folia . . . ; in fundas visci indebant grandiculos globos; i.e. the army as a whole kept doing these things ; 486, ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam. *Eum* here is, of course, indefinite.   A passive metaphrase may make the relation clearer : ' Whoever fell was in each case imme- diately dispatched by me.'   Rud. 540, tibi auscultavi, tu promit- tebas mihi illi esse quaestum maxumum ; ibi me conruere posse aiebas ditias ; Amph. 383, Amphitruonis te esse aiebas Sosiam, may also be of the same nature, — ' kept maintaining.'   Truc. 506, quin ubi natust, machaeram et clupeum poscebat sibi ; Hec. 802, ut quisque venerat, accedebam ; Scipio Min. (Meyer), p. 214, haec cum mihi quisquam narrabat, non poteram animum inducere.

  c) In the passages cited under *a*) and *b*) we have the reiterated act of the same person.   Closely related are those instances in which we have, not the reiterated act of a single person, but the same act repeated by a succession of persons, as, for example, by the individuals of a group; as, Hec. 805, omnes negabant, i.e. the act of denial was repeated by one after another ; so probably in Epid. 603, adulescentem equidem dicebant emisse, i.e. the statement was repeated by one and another (the regular force of ' they' in 'they say') ; Poen. 483, quemquem visco offenderant, tam crebri ad terram reccidebant quam pira ; i.e. the act of falling was repeated by one man after another.

  5. **The aoristic use of the imperfect** (see p. 26).   All recognize the

existence of this usage, but there is much difference of opinion as
to the range of its occurrence. J. Schneider, De temporum apud
priscos Latinos usu, p. 17, holds that the imperfect and perfect were
used promiscuously of aoristic acts. Wheeler, Classical Philology,
i. p. 389, on the other hand, limits the aoristic imperfect mainly to
verbs of saying. Similar is the attitude of Schmalz, Syntax und
Stilistik[4], p. 485. An examination of the complete material belong-
ing to the problem will, I believe, convince all that Schneider's view
is untenable. At the same time I have felt compelled to recognize
more instances of the aoristic imperfect than do either Wheeler or
Schmalz. Yet the great limitation of the usage is obvious. Exam-
ples:

a) *aibam:* Amph. 807, te dormitare aibas; As. 442, aibat reddere;
so also Capt. 561; 676; Cas. 279; Cist. 143; 585; 607; Curc. 488;
582; Epid. 254; Men. 532; 936; 1046; 1141; Merc. 635; 637; 638;
765; 766; 804; M. G. 66; 1107; Most. 806; 1002; 1027; 1028;
Poen. 464; 900; Pseud. 650; 1083; 1118; Rud. 307; 1130; Stich.
391; Trin. 428; 875; 944; 956; 986; 1140; Truc. 757; And. 930;
932; H. T. 960; Phor. 572; Hec. 238; Ad. 561; Titin. 63; Lucil.
381, 2.

Barring a few examples, all of these are taken as aoristic by
Wheeler, op. cit. p. 389. I cannot find that any of them show
decisive marks of any of the types of imperfect that we have recog-
nized above. In the absence of a perfect of *aio* the imperfect seems
to have assumed its functions. It is worthy of note that verbs of
saying by their very nature do not readily lend themselves to im-
perfect uses. Thus while *dico* in Plautus is used over 200 times
in the perfect, it occurs but ten times in the imperfect. It is small
wonder then that the imperfect forms of *aio* have aoristic function.

b) *negabas:* Men. 729, at mihi negabas dudum surrupuisse te;
Pseud. 1314, at negabas daturum esse te; Hec. 538, nam negabas
posse te pati. Wheeler takes all these as progressive. But I can
see no trace of action going on in any of these examples. The act
certainly is not one in process. It is true that in English we can
translate these by 'you were denying,' 'you were saying that . . .
not.' But I am inclined to believe that such expressions are purely
phraseological with us. 'You were saying' seems to me to carry no

implication of action in process, and to be as good a rendering of
modo dixisti as of *modo dicebas*. If that is true, there is need of
caution in making the English translation a test of the 'Aktionsart.'

  c) *eras, erat.*[1] It is so difficult for me to see any notion of con-
tinued action in the imperfect of *sum* that I have unhesitatingly
classed as aoristic nearly all of the instances of *eram* and its com-
pounds. Thus: Amph. 429, cadus erat vini, inde implevi hirneam;
here *erat* seems to me of the same nature as *implevi ;* cf. Wheeler,
op. cit. p. 374. Further examples are: Amph. 1009, (Naucrates)
in navi non erat; As. 927, modo quom dicta in me ingerebas, odium,
non uxor, eram.   In these the idea corresponding to a 'wasn't being'
seems very inappropriate. The obvious force of the verb is a simple
past. Similarly with the following, which I shall not stop to dis-
cuss in detail: Aul. 375, cara omnia, atque eo fuerunt cariora, aes
non erat; Bacch. 563; Capt. 273, non fuit molesta servitus, nec mihi
secus erat quam si, etc.; Cas. 531; 882; 914; Men. 59, ei liberorum
nisi divitiae nihil erat; 1117, vos tum patri filii quot eratis? . . .
uter eratis, tun an ille maior? 1120; 1131; 1135; Merc. 845; M. G.
99; 181; 755, sat erat; 848; 853; 1323; 1430; 1431; Most. 788,
seni non erat otium, id opperitus sum; Pers. 262; Poen. 1069; 1180;
Pseud. 799; Rud. 49; 269, aequius erat; 502; 841, quin occidisti?
:: gladius non erat; 1253; Stich. 539, fuit olim senex; ei filiae duae
erant; . . . erant minori illi adulescenti fidicina et tibicina; sed ille
erat caeleps senex; Trin. 976, postquam me aurum ferre dixi, tu
factus Charmides; prius non eras, quam auri feci mentionem; Truc.
719; And. 86; H. T. 201; 203; 629; Eun. 97, ita res erat, faciundum
fuit; 345; 423; 569; 681; 736, nonne id sat erat? 841; Phor. 36;
654; 768, sat erat; 945; 1012; 1023; Hec. 283; 340; Ad. 234;
494; 716; Enn. Ann. 155, 4; Acc. 320; Cn. Gellius (Peter), p. 94,
23.

  d) Compounds of *sum: poterat:* Aul. 294, quid hic non poterat de
suo opsonari? M. G. 911; Pers. 59, neque eos quisquam poterat
vincere; And. 792; H. T. 785; Hec. 375; cf. Rud. 600, neque eas
eripere quibat; *aderat:* Epid. 612, ibi aderat una Apoecides; Poen.
1178; Phor. 99; 105; 858; Hec. 561; *inerat:* Eun. 584, ibi inerat

---

  [1] Note that by origin *eram* is not an imperfect, but an aorist, like the formative
element *-bam* (see above, p. 26).

pictura; Naev. Bell. Pun. 20; *deerat:* Phor. 299, non ratio, verum argentun deerat.

e) *oportebat:* Men. 195, si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abreptum; H. T. 536, haec facta ab illo oportebat.

f) Barring a few 'shifted imperfects,' for which see below, there remain only the following instances in the entire range of Early Latin which have not already been considered. None of them seem to me to fall under any of the previous categories, but to be aoristic. They are: Aul. 179, itaque abibam invitus; Bacch. 673, quid igitur stulte, quoniam occasio fuit, sic hoc digitulis duobus sumebas prioribus ? 788, orabat quod istic esset scriptum foret ut fieret; Capt. 504, vix ex gratulando miser eminebam; Cist. 568, eam suam esse filiam adiurabat mihi; Merc. 190, quin apstrudebas ? 983 a, vacuom esse his decebat noxiis; Pseud. 421, iam pridem sensi et subolebat mihi; 798, si arbitrabare, cur conducebas ? Truc. 332, non tibi dicebam 'i' modo ? 333, quid iam revocabas ? 813, vir erat, plus valebat; And. 89, (gaudebam); alio die quaerebam: comperiebam nil ad Pamphilum attinere; 490, non imperabat coram; Eun. 111, matris nomen dicebat ipsa; . . . mercator hoc addebat; 533, Thais orabat ut redires; Phor. 595, gaudebat, me laudabat, quaerebat senem dis gratias agebat; 652, mihi venibat in mentem eius incommodum; Hec. 94, illi haud licebat nisi praefinito loqui; 498, quam ob rem te orabam ? Ad. 809, tu illos duo olim pro re tollebas tua; Naev. Praetext. 8, proveniebant oratores novi, stulti adulesculentuli; Cass. Hem. (Peter), p. 73, 28, ille ita rationem reddebat; Calp. Piso (Peter), 83, 30, isque in eo tempore aedili curuli apparebat; CIL, i, 201, 6, animum nostrum non indoucebamus ita facta esse.

6. Imperfects denoting a future from a past standpoint. Attention has already been called (p. 18) to the use of the present as future. Corresponding to that usage, we have in a few instances the imperfect denoting a future act from a past point of view. Thus: Merc. 884, quo nunc ibas ? 981, ibat in exsulatum; Truc. 921, ego ad te ibam; so also, And. 581; Phor. 900, nos ad te ibamus; 902, quid ad me ibatis ? Ad. 820, mane: scio; istuc ibam; Phor. 298, qua ratione inopem potius ducebat domum ? 'was proposing to bring home'; Hec. 171, interea moritur cognatus senex; ea ad hos redibat lege hereditas; see Wheeler, Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 174.

7. The shifted imperfect. Wheeler (Class. Phil. i, p. 376) gives this name to those cases in which the imperfect indicative is equivalent to an imperfect subjunctive with present force, i.e. is equivalent to the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition in the present. But the examples which he cites in illustration of the usage fail in all but *one* instance to conform to his definition. The one instance is Lucil. 150, nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset, hoc sat erat, where *sat erat* is equivalent to *sat esset.* Wheeler's other examples (in independent sentences) are: Merc. 983, etiam loquere larva? vacuom esse istac ted aetate his decebat noxiis; M. G. 911, bonus vates poteras esse; Rud. 269, ergo aequius vos erat candidatas venire hostiatasque; H. T. 785, scite poterat fieri; M. G. 754, quid opus fuit hoc sumptu nostra gratia? insanivisti hercle, nam idem hoc hominibus sat erat decem. In all of these examples the imperfect refers to the past, — 'ought to have avoided,' 'ought to have come,' 'would have made a good prophet,' 'might have been nicely done.' We simply have a familiar Latin idiom, whereby in the case of certain verbs (*possum, decere, debere,* etc.) the Latin uses a past tense (perfect or imperfect) governing a *present infinitive,* where in English we use the *perfect infinitive,* as, 'you ought to have come'; 'you could have done this.' In this usage the Latin form of expression is strictly logical. As Blase well observes (Studien und Kritiken, p. 13), the peculiarity is in the English. In Wheeler's last example (M. G. 754), there is no peculiarity, however. The words are to be taken, I believe, in their literal meaning: 'you were crazy; there was enough here for ten men.'

FURTHER PECULIARITIES OF USAGE.

Imperfect for present. In the dramatists the speaker sometimes puts in the imperfect a thought which belongs to the present as well as the past and which in English we more commonly express by the present tense; as, As. 392, quid quaeritas? : : Demaenetum volebam; 394, ubi est? : : ad tonsorem ire dixit . . . quid volebas? 452, si domi est, Demaenetum volebam; Bacch. 189, recte valet? : : istuc ex te volebam percontarier; Most. 9, hoccine volebas? Trin. 195, istuc volebam scire; Cas. 674, peccavi: illuc dicere volebam; 702, illud quidem volebam; Truc. 719, hicin tu eras? Phor. 858, tu quoque

aderas? : : aderam; 945, tune is eras? Hec. 340, tun hic eras? so Ad. 901; And. 86, illi id erat nomen.

Imperfect with iam dudum, iam pridem, iam diu, with the force of the pluperfect. I have noted only the following instances in Early Latin: Men. 419, iam dudum tibi advorsabar; Poen. 1391, iam pridem scivi et expectabam (assuming that the force of *iam pridem* extends also to *exspectabam*); Pseud. 421, iam pridem sensi et subolebat mihi; H. T. 758, te mi ipsum iam dudum optabam dari; Eun. 1000, iam diu aliquam causam quaerebat senex.

Imperfect of the immediate past. Wheeler (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 168; Classical Philology, i, p. 358) recognizes also as a subdivision of the progressive imperfect an imperfect of the immediate past, and, as a sub-type of that, an interrupted imperfect. Stich. 328 illustrates both these uses: ego quid me velles visebam; nam me quidem harum miserebat. Both *visebam* and *miserebat* refer to the immediate past, and in *visebam* the action is interrupted. In both cases the distinction is real, yet it can hardly be regarded as of vital syntactical importance.

The inceptive and conative imperfects. As Wheeler has shown (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 173), the inceptive force occasionally noticed in passages like Men. 1116, nam tunc dentes mihi cadebant primulum, "arises from the combination of tense and particle. No inceptive function can be proved for the tense alone." There are no certain cases, either, of the conative use in Early Latin (Wheeler, ibid. p. 179). In Epid. 215, eos captabant, the conative force lies in the meaning of the verb itself.

A review of the material under the foregoing categories substantiates the traditional definition of the imperfect indicative as the tense of description, as opposed to the perfect, the tense of narration. But it should be clearly borne in mind that the imperfect is the tense of description by virtue of its dominant progressive character. While, therefore, we may speak of a " descriptive imperfect," we should remember that it is but a common illustration of the basal progressive use.

In Latin, as in Sanskrit and Greek, the imperfect is frequently used in referring to occurrences within the recollection of the speaker

or of the speaker and the person addressed. This is sometimes called the "reminiscent imperfect." But again we have but a phase of the progressive use, and a perfectly natural one, since the visualizing tense of situation is by its nature adapted to the recital of personal experiences.

THE FUTURE INDICATIVE.[1]

There are two future formations in Latin, one in *-am*, another in *-bo*. The former of these is an Indo-European subjunctive; the latter is a new formation (peculiar to Italic and Celtic), which, however, shares the functions of the future in *-am*. Both sets of forms exhibit clear traces of subjunctive influence. Thus we find a variety of uses strongly tinged with volitive meaning; while other uses seem to be developed from the pure future force inherent in one of the phases of the Indo-European subjunctive (see p. 152). There are traces too of optative functions, though these in all probability do not go back to any association of the *-am* subjunctive with optative functions, but are rather an outgrowth of the future force itself.

Another outgrowth of the pure future force is the gnomic or achronistic use. The so-called potential force recognized by some does not seem to rest upon any adequate foundation.

CLASSIFICATION OF FUTURE USES.

The following classification includes volitive, pure future, optative, and achronistic uses as its major categories. Under the volitive and pure future headings a number of minor categories will be considered. For the less usual types the material will be found fairly complete, viz. for the jussive, deliberative, optative, and achronistic uses. For the other and common categories the examples are drawn from two plays, the Mostellaria and the Andria.

I. **Volitive uses of the future indicative.** In the volitive forces of the future indicative the notion of willing is usually much less pronounced than in the volitive uses of the subjunctive. The first per-

---

[1] Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Sprache, iii, p. 112 ff. ; Neumann, H., De futuri in priscorum Latinorum vulgari vel cotidiano sermone vi et usu, 1888; Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, 1904, p. 72 ff. ; Schneider, Jos., De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1888, p. 18 ff. ; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino, 1888, p. 37 ff. ; Van Wijk, Die altitalischen Futura, Indog. Forsch. xvii, p. 465 ff.

son (usually singular) predominates. In a fair number of instances there is a clear idea of resolve or determination. In other cases (and these are much more numerous) the notion is merely of an intended course of action, including threats and promises. We have also permissive futures and futures denoting compliance or assent.

a) Resolves, e.g. And. 276, non faciam ; 380, quidvis patiar; 384, numquam faciam; 415, hoc agam; 775, non hercle faciet ('he will not do it'); Most. 229, venibit multo potius; 238, nam neque edes neque bibes; 846, errabo potius quam perductet; 914, numquam sinam; 1133, non enim ibis.

b) Compliance, a yielding of the will of the speaker, as, And. 45, dic quid est! : : ita faciam; 388, ducas volo hodie uxorem. : : ducam ; 420, neque erit usquam in me mora; 597, faciam hercle sedulo; 681, restitue locum ! : : faciam; 713, veniam; 739, manebo; Most. 246, tibi adsentabor; 398, intro abi et tu! : : morigerae tibi erimus; 401, curabitur; 661, dicam ; 857, haud usquam a pedibus apscedam tuis ; 898, faciam ; 928, faciam ut iubes.

c) Commands (Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus bei Plautus, 1871, p. 23): Amph. 15, ita huic facietis fabulae silentium itaque aequi et iusti hic eritis arbitri; Asin. 373, tu cavebis ne me attingas; Aul. 401, tu istum gallum, si sapis, glabriorem reddes; Bacch. 48; Curc. 728, tu, miles, aput me cenabis ; Men. 122, malo cavebis, si sapis ; virum observare desines ; 692, non feres; Merc. 584, atque hercle invenies tu locum illi, si sapis; Most. 75, ne tu hercle praeterhac mihi non facies moram; 515, non me appellabis, si sapis; M. G. 571, ne tu hercle linguam comprimes posthac; Poen. 675; 1036; H. T. 870, cautim et paulatim dabis, si sapies ; 833, tu hic nos opperibere; Hec. 590, haud facies, neque sinam; Stat. 145, qui sapiet, de me discet; 176, patiere quod dant quando optata non danunt; Afran. 129, me auctore, mater, abstinebis; Cato, Agr. 14, 3, quae opus sunt, dominus praebebit et ad opus dabit; 90, id ubi excluserit, depsito bene . . . postea magis depset; CIL, i, 198, 8, de hisce ioudicium non fiet.

It is a mistake to believe, as is sometimes done, that the future indicative, when used in this function, denotes *per se* any particular kind of command, either mild or peremptory. As a matter of fact it may denote any kind of command, either mild or peremptory. In this it is exactly like the jussive subjunctive and the imperative.

d) Deliberatives.   All of the logical values of the deliberative subjunctive (see p. 228 ff.) may be expressed by the future indicative.   Thus:

1) Inquiry after a command or advice, Merc. 915, paullisper mane! quid, manebo? M. G. 1242, adibon? Rud. 1370, propera!:: quid, properabo?

2) Duty or Fitness, Epid. 151, quid fiet illa fidicina? ('what's to be done?')   So also Phor. 219; Ad. 288; 996; M. G. 973,quid illa faciemus?   So also Eun. 837; Hec. 668; Most. 392, ubi ero? Rud. 189, hancine ego ad rem natam miseram me memorabo? 249, quo, amabo, ibimus? 251, sicine hic cum uvida veste grassabimur? 748, tune . . . liberos parentibus sublectos habebis atque indigno quaestu conteres? 1140, idne habebit hariola? 1270, patri etiam gratulabor? Stich. 428, ad cenam ibon? 599, solus cenabo domi? Truc. 205, ibo igitur intro? 741, meane inimici mei bona istic caedent? And. 453, quem vocabo ad cenam meorum aequalium potissimum? 612, quid ego nunc dicam patri? negabon velle me ducere? H. T. 700, nam quo ore appellabo patrem? Phor. 536, itane hunc patiemur, Geta, fieri miserum? 538, quin beneficium rursum ei experiemur reddere? 917, nam quo redibo ore ad eam? Hec. 671, eho! an non alemus? prodemus potius?   Cato (Jord.) fr. 23, 17, ea nunc derepente tanta beneficia, tantam amicitiam relinquemus? quod illos dicimus voluisse facere, id nos priores facere occupabimus?

3) Helplessness, Hec. 628, quid respondebo his? aut quo pacto hoc operiam? 516, quid agam? quo me vortam? quid viro respondebo?

4) True Deliberative, only Capt. 535, quid loquar? quid fabulabor? quid negabo? aut quid fatebor?

5) Repudiating Question or Exclamation, Men. 197, salta sic cum palla postea!:: ego saltabo! sanus hercle non es; M. G. 1021, quid! ego astabo hic tantisper frustra! Hec. 671, ego alam! Turp. 153, ego praestolabo illi ante ostium! Pseud. 847, tibi nummum dabo!

A few other examples are brought by some scholars under the head of the deliberative.   Thus Bacch. 824, atqui iam dabis.:: dabo? And. 617, at iam expediam.:: expedies? H. T. 1012, nilo minus ego hoc faciam tamen.:: facies? are regarded by some as examples of the repudiating future.   But these are rather scornful inquiries as

to the purpose or intention of the person addressed. They seem to me different from the examples which I have cited under the head of the repudiating future. Even less entitled to rank as deliberatives seem to me Bacch. 145, tu amicam habebis? Curc. 205, quo usque ad hunc modum amore utemur subrepticio? Rud. 817; Trin. 605.

e) Permissive uses, e.g. Most. 392, cum hac, cum istac eris; 884, illi erunt bucaedae potius quam ego sim restio; Cato, Agr. 147, si non exportaverit, dominus vino quid volet faciet.

f) Threats, e.g. Most. 4, te ruri ulciscar; 240, nec recte si dixeris, vapulabis; 384, occidam patrem; 386, vos pro matula, habebo; 587, illunc nominabo; 1114, iam iubebo ignem circumdari; 1167, verberibus caedere pendens; 1168, interimam te; And. 199, te in pistrinum dedam; 776, hunc in viam provolvam; 864, ego te commotum reddam; 866, tibi ostendam erum quid sit pericli fallere; 920, ea quae non volt audiet.

g) Promises, e.g. Most. 253, dabo aliquid hodie peculi; 359, ego dabo ei talentum; 387, istum medicabo metum; 388, ego qui istaec sedem meditabor; 580, reddeturne faenus? :: reddet; 612, is tibi et faenus et sortem dabit; 745, e me nil sciet; 1024, non negabo et dabo; 1131, ibo pro te; 1160, sortem nos dabimus, nos conferemus; And. 171, sat est. curabo; 327, dabo operam; 403, curabitur; 617, at iam expediam; expedies? 622, iam aliquid dispiciam; 684, ubi erit, inventum tibi curabo; 703, hoc effectum reddam; 898, feram.

Under the head of promises falls also the idiomatic use of *amabo* (Blase, Archiv für lat. Lexikographie und Grammatik, ix, p. 485; Hist. Gramm. iii, p. 115). *Amabo*, in the sense of "please" is a very common feature of comic diction, occurring some 90 times in Plautus and 11 times in Terence. The usage originated apparently in connection with imperatives. Thus *dic, amabo!* meant originally, "tell me! I will love you (for it)." When once it had established itself in this environment, it naturally extended to other combinations, particularly questions; but it also occurs occasionally in other connections. Examples:

1) With imperatives and equivalent subjunctives:

Present 2d singular, Cas. 137, sine, amabo, ted amari; 641, obtine auris, amabo; Men. 541, amabo, mi Menaechme, inauris da

mihi; 678, pallam illam, amabo, mihi eam redde; Eun. 838, vide,
amabo.

Present 2d plural, Cist. 643, amabo, accurrite; Stich. 752,
date mi locum, ubi accumbam, amabo; Eun. 130.

Negative present, Amph. 540, noli, amabo, irasci; Curc. 137,
ne plora, amabo; Poen. 370; Naev. Com. 82, cave ⟨ne⟩ cadas, amabo.

Future 2d singular, As. 939, de palla memento, amabo; Cas.
832; Titin. 109.

Jussive, Bacch. 44, id, amabo te, huic caveas; Rud. 427.

2) In questions, Curc. 110 b, amabo, quoia vox sonat procul?
Most. 343, quin, amabo, accubas? Poen. 263, eho, amabo, quid illo
nunc properas? 399; H. T. 404, amabo, quid tibist? Titin. 80.

3) In other connections, M. G. 1084, iam iam sat amabost; Cist.
110, sed, amabo, tranquille; Truc. 873; Bacch. 1149; 1197.

The purely formulaic character of the expression is indicated by
the fact that *te*, which logically should be present, is usually lacking.
Amabo is regularly used only by women, addressing men, occasion-
ally by men addressing women, never by men to men.

h) Announcements or declarations of intention. The volitional
element here sinks to its lowest terms. Examples: Most. 82, nunc
rus abibo; similarly, 317; 540; 849; And. 374; 594; 599; Most.
94, faciam ut credatis; 174, te donabo aliqui; 338, iam revortar;
344, dormiam; 405, hasce ego aedis occludam; 426, ego occludam
. . . ludos faciam . . . concedam, hinc speculabor; 445, pultabo;
543, accedam atque appellabo; similarly, 689; 717; 566, occupabo
adire; 614, feram, si quid datur; 683, te opperiar; so also And. 235;
Most. 741, eloquar; so also, 945; And. Alt. Ex. 6; Most. 757, dicam;
so also, 888; 931; And. 615; Most. 783, congrediar; 963, pergam
percontarier; 1061, praeoccupabo atque anteveniam et foedus fe-
riam; 1066, illum praestolabor; 1070, non illi extemplo hamum
ostendam, sensim mittam lineam, dissimulabo me horum quicquam
scire; 1074, adgrediar, appellabo; 1094, interim hanc aram occu-
pabo; 1096, hic praesidebo; And. 48, rem omnem a principio audies
et consilium cognosces; similarly 103; 579; 116, scies; so also, 585;
312, hunc ipsum orabo, huic supplicabo, amorem huic narrabo; 431,
renuntiabo; 527, nunc Chremem conveniam, orabo gnato uxorem;
701, id faciam; 705, quid facies (inquiry after intention); 670, alia

adgrediemur via; 708, ego hanc visam; 715, iam hic adero; 734, ab dextera venire me adsimulabo; 893, quid dices mihi; 974, conloquar.

II. **Pure future uses.** As already stated, these apparently go back to the pure future use of the Indo-European subjunctive (see p. 154). We distinguish:

a) Expressions of expectation, e.g. Most. 98, haud aliter dicetis; 228, sat ero dives; 231, magis amabunt quom me videbunt; 383, pater aderit iam meus; 510, hanc conturbabunt fabulam; 776, quid mihi fiet? 870, probe tectum habebo; 882, mane castigabit eos; 997, verum iam scibo; 1077, Philolaches iam aderit; 1099, tanto condemnabo facilius; And. 112, quid hic mihi faciet? 247, nullon pacto adfinitatem effugere potero? 208, me aut erum pessum dabunt; 313, credo, impetrabo; 379, culpam in te transferet; tunc istae turbae fient; 389, cedo quid iurgabit tecum? 396, inveniet inopem; 398, aliam quaeret; 441, deinde desinet; 571, tibi generum firmum et filiae invenies virum; 674, geminas conficies nuptias; 773, si viderit, gnatam non dabit: tanto hercle magis dabit; 837, ubi causa erit adempta, desinent.

b) Predictions, e.g. Most. 18, cis paucas tempestates augebis numerum; 56, ita te forabunt; 196, te ille deseret aetate; 217, male querere; 559, tum facile vinces; 712, nil erit quod accusites; 1087, numquam edepol dabit; 1179, ibi poteris ulcisci probe; And. 389, reddes omnia consilia incerta; 395, propulsabo facile uxorem; dabit nemo.

c) Statements of what one knows is sure to happen, e.g. And. 178, numquam verbum fecit; at nunc faciet; 507, puerum huc deferent; 980, intus despondebitur; intus transigetur.

III. **Optative uses.** The future indicative is also used in wishes: Amph. 563, malum quod (= *aliquod*) tibi di dabunt; Pseud. 1130; As. 623, salve; dabunt di quae velitis vobis; Trin. 576, di fortunabunt vostra consilia::ita volo; Pers. 16, O Sagaristio, di ament te.::O Toxile, dabunt di quae exoptes; 205, Sophoclidisca, di me amabunt; Men. 278, Menaechme, salve.::di te amabunt; Rud. 107, at di dabunt. ::quisquis es, magnum malum. Under this head falls also the formula, ita me amabit (amabunt): Capt. 877; Merc. 762, ita me amabit Iupiter, ut ego illud numquam dixi; Curc. 326, ita me amabit, quam ego amo, ut ego haud mentior; Truc. 276; Aul. 496; 761; Men. 278;

Poen. 439; 869; 1219; Most. 520, ita me di amabunt, mortuom credidi expostulare; Trin. 447; H. T. 463, sic me di amabunt, ut me tuarum miseritumst fortunarum; 749; Hec. 106.

Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, p. 73 f., denies the optative character of this usage. To his mind, *ita me amabit Iuppiter* is not equivalent in meaning to *ita me Iuppiter amet*, the former being rather merely an expression of confident assurance. But he does not mention, and apparently does not consider, all the material above cited. Passages like As. 623 and Pers. 16 seem to me decisive. I can account for the subjunctive in these only on the theory of attraction, *dabunt* being felt to be equivalent to an optative subjunctive. So also in Trin. 576, we cannot ignore the significance of *ita volo* following *di fortunabunt vostra consilia.*

IV. The achronistic use of the future indicative (Neumann, p. 57). The future indicative is occasionally used without reference to time, but to express a general truth belonging to all time (Schneider, p. 18; Blase, Hist. Gramm. p. 120), as, Most. 289, pulchra mulier nuda erit quam purpurata pulchrior; 1041, qui homo timidus erit in rebus dubiis, nauci non erit; Pers. 365, virgo atque mulier nulla erit quin sit mala; Amph. 173, nec aequom anne iniquom imperet cogitabit; Men. 90, dum tu illi quod edit et quod potet praebeas, numquam fugiet; facile adservabis; And. 10, qui utramvis recte norit, ambas noverit; Ad. 55, qui mentiri aut fallere insuerit patrem tanto magis audebit ceteros; 72, ille quem beneficio adiungas praesens absensque idem erit; Afran. 7, haut facul, ut ait Pacuvius, femina invenietur bona; Naev. Com. 90, numquam quisquam amico amanti amica nimis fiet fidelis, nec nimis morigera et devota quisquam erit; Lucil. 777 nonnumquam dabit ipsa aetas quod prosit habendo; Cato, Agr. 135, 3, (fiscinae) optimae erunt Romae.

V. The potential future. Some scholars (Blase, Neumann) recognize a so-called potential use of the future, designated also as "Futurum der Wahrscheinlichkeit" (Blase, p. 119). As examples of this usage are cited passages like Pseud. 677, sed profecto hoc sic erit: centum doctum hominum consilia sola haec devincit dea Fortuna; As. 734, hic inerunt viginti minae; Bacch. 273, porro etiam ausculta pugnam quam voluit dare . . . em, accipitrina haec erit; Curc. 473, ibidem erunt scorta exoleta; 493, et quidem meminisse ego haec

volam te; Epid. 291, quem hominem inveniemus ad eam rem utilem? :: hic erit optumus; 658, memento suppetias mihi ferre. :: facile istuc erit; Pers. 437, cape hoc sis. :: nummi sescenti hic inerunt; 645, haec erit bono genere nata; Plaut. Frag. Incert. 123, tene crumi-nam! inerunt triginta minae; H. T. 1014, subditum ain tu? :: sic erit; similarly Eun. 1058; Phor. 801; Ad. 182.

But I can discover nothing potential about these expressions, which are typical of those usually referred to this class. They are idiomatic uses, to be sure, but their peculiarity is not connected with the potential. The tense in each of the foregoing passages seems to me to be a true future. Only, the idea is inexactly expressed. When in As. 734, for example, the speaker says, hic inerunt viginti minae, he means that the person addressed *will find* twenty minae in the bag when he comes to count the money. Similarly in the other passages above cited. See especially Sjögren, p. 109 ff., who shows the lack of ground for recognizing a potential future.

M. G. 395, narrandum ego istuc militi censebo, sometimes cited as a potential future, is probably to be taken as an illustration of formal assimilation of the tense of *censeo* to the time of *narrandum*. Logi-cally, the idea would be expressed by *censeo*. An analogous case of attraction is seen in M. G. 651, plus dabo quam praedicabo ex me venustatis tibi, where logically the idea of *praedicabo* would be expressed by *praedicavi* or *praedico*. Trin. 606, non credibile dices, is regarded by Sjögren, p. 117, as an error for *dicis;* cf. also p. 233.

THE PERFECT INDICATIVE.[1]

As in form, so in meaning the Latin perfect indicative represents both the Indo-European perfect and aorist. The force of the former is seen in the present perfect; that of the latter in the historical perfect.

A. PRESENT PERFECT.

Besides its common function of denoting an action completed at the present time, the present perfect also denotes the continued state resulting from a completed act, as in *memini, odi, novi, perii, occidi, interii*. Most of these are so common as to call for no special

[1] Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 160 ff.; Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 314 ff.

citations. Less frequent in this use are: *actum est* (Cist. 685;
Pseud. 85; 1221; Stich. 751; And. 465; Eun. 54); Rud. 683, acta
haec res est; Most. 365, absumpti sumus; Amph. 1058, corrupta
sum atque absumpta sum; M. G. 172, occisi sumus; Bacch. 161;
M. G. 202, astitit severo fronte curam cogitans.

The perfect also, like the present, serves as future, especially in
the apodosis of conditional sentences, e.g. Amph. 428, victus sum si
dixeris: Asin. 360, si ille argentum prius adfert, continuo nos exclusi
sumus; Epid. 82, nisi quid in tete auxili est, absumptus es; M. G.
163, disperiistis, ni mulcassitis; Trin. 595, id si alienatur, actum est
de collo meo; Capt. 539; Eun. 1064, si offendero, periisti; And. 961,
immortalitas partast, si nulla aegritudo intercesserit. — As future
perfect: Most. 827, boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice.

At times also the perfect has an achronistic force, as, Epid. 425,
nihil amicost opportuno amicius; sine tuo labore quod velis actumst
tamen; Trin. 308, si animus hominem pepulit, actumst; Capt. 256,
saepe is cautor captus est; Ad. 855.

Referable to an original present perfect use is probably also the
type represented by the Virgilian *fuimus Troes, Ilium fuit*, e.g.
Pseud. 311, ilico vixit amator, ubi supplicat; Pers. 637, omne ego
pro nihilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit.

Following the analogy of *novi*, we find also the perfect *scivi* with
the force of 'I know,' *e.g.* Poen. 724, scitis? : : scivimus; so 725.
Similarly *nescivi*, Capt. 265, si quid nescivi (Acidalius, *nescibo*), id
nescium tradam tibi; Poen. 629; Pseud. 977.

B. Historical Perfect.

Besides the ordinary uses of the historical perfect, we have to
note especially the use of the perfect indicative as the equivalent of
the pluperfect subjunctive: M. G. 803, non potuit reperire lepidiores
duas; 1076, hanc vendere potuit operam; Most. 573, numquam
potuisti magis opportunus advenire; 1162, non potuit venire orator
magis impetrabilis; Poen. 583, non potuisti adducere homines;
Pseud. 669, non potuit opportunius advenire; 793; Stich. 301, qui
potuit scire? Truc. 635, quo pacto excludi potui planius? Curc.
110 b, canem esse hanc quidem magis par fuit; Epid. 388, fuit con-
ducibile hoc quidem mea sententia; M. G. 725, aequom fuit deos

paravisse uno exemplo ne omnes viverent; Pseud. 688, aurichalco
contra non carum fuit; M. G. 730, itidem divos dispertisse vitam
humanam aequom fuit; 1112, tu quidem ad equas fuisti scitus
admissarius; Truc. 140, si rem servassem, fuit ubi negotiosus
essem.

Common to both the present and historical perfects is the frequent
use in Early Latin of the auxiliary *fui* instead of *sum*. But this
peculiarity belongs rather to the formal than the syntactical field.
See Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre der lat. Spr. iii, p. 135 ff.; Blase,
Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 173.

THE PLUPERFECT INDICATIVE.[1]

It is uncertain whether the pluperfect indicative is a descendant
of the Indo-European aorist or is a new formation by proportional
analogy, *videram* being formed from *videro* (which is Indo-European)
after the relationship between *ero* and *eram*. At all events the
notion of priority in past time inhering in this tense in classical
Latin cannot have been original. In Indo-European there were no
tenses for relative time. The time-sphere of every tense was present,
past, or future with reference only to the speaker's (or thinker's)
present, not with reference to any other past, or future, act or state.
Originally in Indo-European, priority in past time must have been
indicated by the aorist. But the aorist did not of itself denote prior
action in past time. This relation was purely a suggestion of the
context. So in Latin the perfect, not only originally, but occasion-
ally in the classical period as well, served as the less accurate tense
of prior past action, e.g. Cist. 611, quam duxit uxorem, ex ea natast
haec; Livy, quosque fors obtulit, interfecere. So regularly with
postquam, ubi, ut, etc. But for the more precise designation of prior
action in past time, the pluperfect came to be used. At first this
tense could have been no more pluperfect in character than the
aorist, but in time it was differentiated. To what extent its original
aorist character still persists in Early Latin will be considered
below.

[1] Blase, Geschichte des Plusquamperfekts im Lateinischen, 1894; Hist. Gramm.
der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 210 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, ii, p. 317 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze
Vgl. Grammatik, p. 569 ff.; 576; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino, 1888, p.
27 ff.; J. Schneider, De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1888, p. 28 ff.

CLASSIFICATION OF PLUPERFECT USES.

1. The pluperfect denotes an action prior to another past act or to a past point of time *explicitly mentioned* in the immediate context, e.g. Asin. 211, quod iusseram, quod volueram faciebatis; Aul. 427; Bacch. 959, iam duo restabant fata tunc nec magis id ceperam oppidum; Capt. 305, me, qui liber fueram, servom fecit; Cas. 580; 912, non fuit quicquid holerum, nisi, quidquid erat, calamitas numquam attigerat; Curc. 602, pater istum meus gestitavit; mater ei utendam dederat; Men. 29, Tarenti ludi forte erant; mortales multi convenerant; 483, mulier quidquid dixerat, idem dicebam; 717, omnia mala ingerebat quemquam aspexerat; 986, postquam conlocavi ut iusserat; M. G. 26, ei pugno praefregisti bracchium. :: at indiligenter iceram; Most. 185, quod promiseram perdidisti; Poen. 63, pollinctor dixit qui pollinxerat; 483, quemquem offenderant, reccidebant; 486, ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam; Pseud. 53, prius quam abiit, xv minas dederat; 676, cuncta in ordine, ut volueram, habebam; 1091, attulit sumbolum qui convenerat; 1117; Rud. 47, flocci non fecit fidem neque quod iuratus adulescenti dixerat; 59, adulescenti qui puellam ab eo emerat, ait sese velle votum solvere; 65, ad portum adulescens venit; navis longe in altum abscesserat; 1186; 1253; Stich. 542, erant minori illi fidicina et tibicina, peregre advexerat; 540, erant duobus nuptae fratribus; Trin. 161, alium me fecisti; alius veneram; 827, placido te usus sum; hanc tuam gloriam iam ante acceperam; 1056, talentum quoi dederam, talento inimicum emi; 1083, quis emit? :: Callicles, quoi tuam rem commendaveras; Truc. 648, argentum debebat qui ovis erat mercatus; 821, loquere quis stupraverit :: Diniarchus, quoi desponderas; And. 238, uxorem decrerat dare; nonne oportuit praescisse me ante? 241, Chremes, qui denegarat, id mutavit? H. T. 600, fuit quaedam anus; huic haec argenti mille dederat mutuom; 661, quid renuntiavit? :: fecisse id quod iusseram; Eun. 114, addebat, e praedonibus unde emerat se audisse abreptam e Sunio; 125, miles qui me amare occeperat in Cariamst profectus; 234, conveni quendam hominem qui abligurrierat; 397, rex semper maxumas mihi agebat quidquid egeram; 404, si quando odium ceperat; 412, unus tamen impense (invidit) elephantis quem praefecerat; 428, tuomne hoc dictum erat? vetus

credidi. :: audieras ? 451, bene dixti ac mi istuc non in mentem ve-
nerat. :: ridiculum; non enim cogitaras; 633, praeterii imprudens
villam. longe abieram, quom sensi; 654, quam erae dederat, virginem
vitiavit; 672, si cessassem, non offendissem; ita iam adornarat
fugam; Phor. 84, neque (erat) quod daretur quicquam; id curarant
patres; 575, venisse eas audivi ex nauta qui illas vexerat; 594, vix-
dum dimidium dixerat; intellexerat; Hec. 4, ita populus studio
stupidus in funambulo animum occuparat; 130, ubiquomque datum
erat spatium solitudinis; 181; 802; 862, recte amasti uxorem tuam;
nam numquam ante hunc diem eam videram; Ad. 306, neque illum
misericordia repressit quoi per vim vitium obtulerat; 435; 618, ut
forte erat missa, ilico accedo; 629, non me hanc rem patri, ut ut
erat gesta, indicasse! 676, advorsumne illum dicerem quoi veneram
advocatus! CIL, i, 541, quod in bello voverat, hanc aedem dedicat.
The following examples show the auxiliary *fueram,* instead of *eram,*
in the passive form: Amph. 430, eam ego vini, ut matre natum
fuerat, eduxi meri; Merc. 232, (capram) posterius quam mercatus
fueram, visus sum simiae concredere; Most. 486, condormivimus;
lucernam forte oblitus fueram exstinguere; Eun. 569, erat quidam
eunuchus quem mercatus fuerat.

The name ' rhetorical pluperfect' is sometimes given to those in-
dependent pluperfects which are followed by a perfect indicative or
historical present; see Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 213,
e.g. Curc. 644, ea me spectatum tulerat; postquam illo ventum est,
exoritur ventus; Aul. 312, ipsi pridem tonsor unguis dempserat;
conlegit, omnia apstulit praesegmina; Bacch. 631, militis parasitus
modo venerat; eum reppuli; Merc. 616, iam addicta atque abducta
erat, quom ad portum venio; Phor. 101, commorat omnis nos; ibi
continuo Antipho (dixit); Hec. 297, vix me abstraxi, vixque huc
contuleram; em, nova res ortast; passive with auxiliary *fueram:*
Hec. 640, abducta a vobis praegnas fuerat filia neque scivi.

2. **The pluperfect refers to an act prior to another past act or point of**
time *implied* in the context, e.g. Asin. 450, non te provideram, i.e. at
the time I noticed you; so And. 183, erus est, neque provideram;
Ad. 373, haud aspexeram te; Eun. 1030; Cas. 898, memora, ut occe-
peras, i.e. before you were interrupted; so Pers. 809, perge ut coe-
peras; Asin. 125; similarly Epid. 389, qui dudum coeperam me

excruciare; Men. 807, spinter quod ad hanc detulerat, nunc, quia rescivi, refert; Rud. 864, equidem me dixeram praesto fore, i.e. before I set sail; Stich. 516, at apud me perendie; nam ille heri me iam vocaverat; Truc. 393, me habebat, dum hic fuit. : : senseram; And. 733, repudio quod consilium primum intenderam; H. T. 1053, video non licere ut coeperam hoc pertendere; Eun. 665, amatores audieram mulierum esse eos maxumos; verum non in mentem venerat, i.e. before he came; Phor. 422, nam tua praeterierat ad ducendum aetas; 814; with *fueram* for *eram:* Eun. 280, fortasse tu profectus alio fueras, i.e. at the time I stopped you; Ad. 174, non innueram, i.e. at the time you struck him.

3. The pluperfect refers to a past act not conceived as prior to another past act.[1] This is the most frequent use of the tense in Early Latin, and the one that probably expresses its original force. Examples:

a) *Dixeram:* Amph. 691, qui non abiisti ita ut dixeras; 761; 916, ioco illa dixeram; 918, quin adducis Naucratem, quem te adducturum dixeras? Aul. 287, istuc aliovorsum dixeram; Bacch. 957, dudum primo ut dixeram nostro seni mendacium, ibi signum ex arce apstuli; Capt. 17, fugitivos ille, ut dixeram ante, vendidit; 194, quo ire dixeram mox ivero; Cas. 599, nempe dixeras tuam arcessituram esse uxorem; Men. 57, ille quem dudum dixeram; 592, aut plus aut minus quam opus erat dicto dixeram; 889, quid esse illi morbi dixeras? 1095, Menaechmum te vocari dixeras; Merc. 467, is se ad portum dixerat ire; 760, nempe uxor rurist tua, quam dudum dixeras te odisse; 975, ille quidem illam se matri emisse dixerat; Pers. 576; Pseud. 406, iam pridem huic daturum dixeram et volui inicere tragulam in nostrum senem; 565, neque sim facturus quod dixeram; Rud. 95; Truc. 133; Phor. 612, audistin quae facta? : : omnia. : : tun dixeras huic?

b) *Iusseram:* Amph. 469, neque credet huc profectum ut iusserat; Asin. 714, istunc amoves atque illa quae hic iusserat mihi statuis? Aul. 697, miror ubi sit, quem iusseram hic opperiri; 679, observabo aurum ubi abstrudat, quamquam iusserat; Cas. 147, prandium iusserat senex parari; Curc. 42, nempe obloqui me iusseras; 425; 560, iusseram salvere te; Merc. 698, demiror non

---

[1] Lübbert, Syntax von *Quom,* p. 168; Brix on Capt. 17; Ussing on Amph. 379.

venire ut iusseram; Pseud. 961, in id angiportum me devorti
iusserat. — Not in Terence.

c) *Fueram :* Amph. 458, imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat,
possidet; Curc. 637, mihi dedit, ut aequom fuerat; Merc. 972, te
haud aequom filio fuerat amicam eripere; M. G. 131, ad meum erum,
qui Athenis fuerat; Poen. 64, ei filius unicus qui fuerat; And. 587,
non fuerant nuptiae futurae; so 543; Eun. 869, ut eam non possim,
ita ut aequom fuerat atque ut studui, tradere; Phor. 400, si falsum
fuerat, quor non refellit? 651, ita ut aequom fuerat, volui uxorem
ducere; 781, praesens quod fuerat malum, in diem abiit; Hec. 570,
hoc mi unum relicuom fuerat malum; 648, etiam si fuerat ambiguom,
nunc non est; 812; 867, quos fuerat par resciscere, sciunt; Ad. 686,
virginem vitiasti, quam te non ius fuerat tangere.

d) *Dederam :* Men. 426, pallam quam dudum dederas ad phrygi-
onem ut deferas; Pseud. 617, servos eius qui hinc a nobis est
mercatus mulierem, qui xv dederat minas, v debet; H. T. 660,
vivitne illa quoi tu dederas?

e) *Volueram ; nolueram :* Cas. 461, me, quom veneram, facere atri-
ensem voluerat; Bacch. 150, video plus quam volueram; Rud. 707,
huc respice! : : optume, istuc volueramus; H. T. 866; Hec. 711, ipsa
narravit mihi. id hoc praesente tibi nolueram dicere.

f) *Reliqueram :* Capt. 938, postulo ut mihi illum reddas servom
quem hic reliqueram; M. G. 1347, animus hanc modo hic reliquerat.

g) *Other verbs :* Amph. 22, scibat quippe qui intellexerat; 383,
Amphitruonis te esse aiebas Sosiam. : : peccaveram, nam 'Amphitru-
onem socium' dudum me esse volui dicere; Aul. 33, quo ille
eam facilius ducat qui compresserat; 635, illud quod apstuleras
cedo; so also 766; 683, obsecro quod dudum obsecraveram; Capt.
156, fugitant hanc provinciam quoi optigerat; Cist. 187, si possiet
illam invenire quam olim tollere ex insidiis viderat; 547, vidi exeun-
tem mulierem — : : illam quae meam gnatam sustulerat? M. G. 474,
eam osculantem hic videras; Most. 519, an tu appellaveras? 525, cur
tanto opere extimueras? 547; 786, quod me miseras adfero; 821, eo
pretio empti fuerant olim. : : audin 'fuerant' dicere? 822, quanti
hosce emeras; Pers. 108, sed ecquid meministi here qua de re men-
tionem feceram? Pseud. 148, heri edixeram omnibus dederamque
eas provincias; 549; 743, meo ludo lamberas; Rud. 554, si me

Plesidippus viderit, quo ab arrabonem acceperam; 850, is nunc cum
servis servat. : : ego mandaveram; Stich. 251, iamne cocta sunt?
quot agnis fecerat? 651, sed amica mea curaest ut valeat; Sticho
mandaveram ut nuntiaret; H. T. 330; Eun. 258, quibus et re salva
et perdita profueram et prosum saepe; 856, quid feceras? : : paulum
quiddam; Phor. 913, ferme eadem omnia quae dudum incusaveras;
Hec. 142, ille invitus illam duxerat; Ad. 26, non rediit Aeschinus
neque servolorum quisquam qui advorsum ierant? 347, testis mecum
est anulus quem amiserat; with *fueram* as auxiliary: Phor. 536, si
pote fuisset exorarier, promissum fuerat.

Barring the examples with *fueram*,[1] Blase (Geschichte des Plus-
quamperfekts, p. 9 ff.; Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 211 ff.)
takes the foregoing examples as referring to an act prior to a point
in past time more or less clearly defined in the mind of the speaker.
In this he is followed by Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 318 ff. Cf. also
Rodenbusch, op. cit. p. 30 ff. But the explanations of these scholars
seem to me far-fetched and unnatural. To my mind it is much
simpler in view of the facts not to attempt to explain the pluperfect
of Early Latin as necessarily denoting an act prior to another past
act, but to recognize that it is generally used without such connota-
tion. If it be asked wherein the pluperfect, when so employed,
differs from the simple perfect, I would suggest that possibly it
often denoted an act completed in past time; i.e. it bore the same
relation to the imperfect that the present-perfect bore to the present.
As an outgrowth of this was the force of the pluperfect referring to
the remoter past (cf. Lübbert, Syntax von *Quom*, p. 168). Out of
these uses there ultimately grew up the use of the pluperfect refer-
ring to an act prior to some other past act definitely alluded to in
the immediate context. Evidently this use developed in the period
from Plautus to Terence, for the six plays of Terence have more
instances of such pluperfects than the twenty plays of Plautus,
while instances of the use which I hold to be original are much less
abundant in Terence than in Plautus.

    4. *Satius fuerat, aequius fuerat, par fuerat*, etc. in the sense of 'would
have been preferable,' 'would have been fairer,' etc.:[2] Cist. 42, satius

---

    [1] This B. regards as arising from a contamination in use of *fui* and *eram*, and to
be equivalent to either *eram* or *fui*; Hist. Gramm. p. 217 ff.
    [2] Blase, Hist. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 222 f.; Delbrück,Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 320.

fuerat eam viro dare nuptum; Curc. 266, namque incubare satius te
fuerat Iovi; Stich. 512, magis par fuerat me vobis dare cenam; Trin.
119, ei rei operam dare te fuerat aliquanto aequius, si posses, etc.;
1039, ad parietem sunt fixae, ubi malos mores adfigi nimio fuerat
aequius; Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius agere aetatem; 561,
aderam, quoius consilio par fuerat ea prospici; And. 691, quibus
quidem quam facile potuerat quiesci, si hic quiesset.

Blase, l. c., includes under this head also Curc. 638; Eun.
870; Phor. 651; Hec. 867; Ad. 686. But all of these seem to me
different from the examples just cited. I have classified them above
(**3, c**) as illustrations of the pluperfect referring to the simple past.
Delbrück, l. c., would interpret all instances of *satius fuerat, aequom
fuerat*, etc. as normal pluperfects.

5. Different from the instances included under (**4**) is M. G. 52,
quingentos simul, ni hebes machaera foret, occideras. Here *occideras*
by a rhetorical exaggeration is used for *occidisses.*

**6. The pluperfect is also used to denote the state resulting from a com-
pleted past act,** e.g. Capt. 306, me qui imperare insueram; Epid.
223, quid erat induta? Pseud. 913 a, ubi restiteras? Catulus,
Baehrens, p. 276, constiteram Auroram salutans, quom subito Roscius
exoritur.

THE FUTURE PERFECT INDICATIVE.[1]

The Latin future perfect is by origin an aorist subjunctive. As such
its 'Aktionsart' was momentary ('punktuell'). Its time was future.
The future perfect indicative, therefore, differed originally from the
future only in the kind of action it denoted; it did not differ in the
time-sphere. In subordinate clauses, however, the future perfect,
like the Greek aorist subjunctive under the same conditions, devel-
oped secondarily a genuine future perfect force, i.e. it came to desig-
nate a future act which was prior to another future act. This true
future perfect function was in Early Latin at times transferred to
principal clauses also.

[1] Madvig, De formarum quarundam verbi latini vi et usu, Opuscula Academica,
1835, ii, p. 60 ff.; P. Thomas, La syntaxe du futur passé dans Térence, Revue de
l'instruction publique Belge, 1876, p. 365 ff.; 1878, p. 17 ff.; Meifart, De futuri exacti
usu Plautino, 1885; Fr. Cramer, Das lat. Futurum Exactum, Arch. für lat. Lexikogr.
iv, p. 594 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 176 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt.
ii, p. 321 ff.; Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, 1904, p. 135 ff.

Madvig, l. c., recognized the true future perfect force as original in the tense, but I agree entirely with Meifart, Delbrück, Blase, and Sjögren that this view is inconsistent with the obvious facts of usage in Early Latin, as well as with the origin of the formation itself. We may even go further than this. In the first and second conjugations it is clear that the future in *-bo* is a new formation historically later than the future perfect. In these conjugations, therefore, the future perfect was not only originally a future, but for a time, at least, the only future of which we have any record.

<center>CLASSIFICATION OF FUTURE PERFECT USES.</center>

I. The Future Perfect with the Force of the Future.

1. 1st singular: Amph. 53, deus sum, commutavero; 198, solens meo more fecero; so As. 705; Cas. 869; Men. 424; Merc. 497; Poen. 857; Stich. 351; Phor. 882; Amph. 930, comitem mihi Pudicitiam duxero; 1000, illuc susum escendero; As. 327, mansero tuo arbitratu; 439, sic dedero; so also Bacch. 49; Most. 1103; Poen. 1286; As. 839, ne dixis istuc! . . . ilico non dixero; so also Pers. 185; Pseud. 755; Trin. 465; Phor. 681; Aul. 570, at ego iussero cadum vini adferrier; so also Cas. 613; Epid. 657; Stich. 607; Aul. 666, huc concessero; Most. 687; Pers. 50; Trin. 1007; Bacch. 211, immo hercle abiero; so also Epid. 515; Most. 590; Poen. 442; Pers. 250; Ad. 127; Bacch. 363, aufugero; 774, accessero; so also Pers. 575; Bacch. 1066, revenero; so also M. G. 863; Rud. 779; Capt. 194, ad fratrem mox ivero; so also Stich. 484; Capt. 293, eadem ex hoc quae volo exquaesivero; so Rud. 330; Capt. 314, uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curaverit; 340, hunc mihi des quem mittam. : : immo alium potius misero; 495, sic egero; Cas. 297, ego pol istam iam aliquovorsum tragulam decidero; 545, post convenero; 781, ego ruri cenavero; so Most. 1007; Cas. 787, cras habuero tamen convivium; 966, nunc ego tecum aequom arbitrum captavero; so Turp. 86; Men. 270, id utrumque cavero; so Pseud. 478; Men. 545, poste reddidero tibi; 670, at placuero huic Erotio; Merc. 413, quid illa nunc fiet? : : ego emero matri tuae ancillam; 448, istanc rem ego recte videro; so also 450; And. 456; Hec. 701; Ad. 538; 845; Merc. 548, vino et amore delectavero; M. G. 200, ego hinc abscessero aps te interim; Most.

526, ego mihi providero; 921, vel mihi denumerato! ego illi porro denumeravero; 1039, sume! : : eademque opera haec tibi narravero; so also Pseud. 721; Afran. 72; Most. 1143, surge! ego isti adsedero; 1174, ego illum ut sit quietus subegero; Pers. 135, tun illam vendas! : : immo alium adlegavero; 568, venient ad te comissatum. : : at ego intromitti votuero; Poen. 1286, sic dedero; aere militari tetigero lenunculum; 984, si non, tum ad horum mores linguam vortero; Pseud. 333, eadem duo greges virgarum ulmearum adegero; 376, cum illo perdidero fidem; 630, vinctam potius sic servavero; 647, rediero; Rud. 788, recessero; Stich. 93, vos sedete! ego sedero in subsellio; 593, quin tum stans obstrusero aliquid strenue; Trin. 607, si hoc non credis, ego credidero; 655, omnia . . . scio, vel exsignavero; Truc. 547, mox cubitum venero; so also 883; And. 641, molestus certe ei fuero atque animo morem gessero; H. T. 86, aut consolando aut consilio aut re iuvero; 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero; Hec. 599, et illis morem gessero; Atta, 5, aquae ita muginantur hodie. : : atqui ego fontem occlusero. *Faxo* is particularly frequent in this use, e.g. Aul. 578, ego faxo et operam et vinum perdiderit simul; Capt. 801, qui mi opstiterit, faxo vitae is opstiterit suae; Poen. 346, faxo constiterit lymphaticum. For further examples, see p. 225.

2. **2d singular:** Amph. 313, quid si ego illum tangam ut dormiat? : : servaveris; Bacch. 49, eadem biberis; Capt. 296, haec eadem si confiteri vis, tua ex re feceris; so also 1028; Curc. 665; Men. 272; 661; Merc. 139; M. G. 1243; Poen. 1216; 1218; Pseud. 512; Trin. 279; And. 397; Phor. 430; cf. Bacch. 695, effeceris; Capt. 344, at nihil est ignotum mittere; operam luseris; M. G. 297, si falso insimulas, perieris; 572, quod scies, nesciveris; Most. 1151, optumas frustrationes dederis in comoediis; Trin. 60, faxo haud tantillum dederis verborum mihi. : : namque enim tu credo me imprudentem obrepseris; Rud. 1151, nugas magnas egeris; Trin. 379, eo pacto addideris nostrae famam familiae; 760, ne tu illud verbum actutum inveneris; And. 640, nil promoveris; H. T. 487, dare denegaris; Eun. 379, perculeris iam tu me; Hec. 401, et illi miserae indigne factam iniuriam contexeris; Ad. 602, illi ita animum relevabis et tuo officio fueris functus; 819, et mi et tibi et illis dempseris molestiam; 844, eo pacto prorsum illi adligaris filium; Enn. Trag. 165, facile Achivos flexeris.

An examination of the complete context of the foregoing examples of the 2d singular shows that in the large majority of instances the future perfect is the apodosis of a conditional sentence.

3. 3d singular. Here also the usage is largely confined to apodoses of conditional sentences; e.g. As. 446, perii hercle; iam hic me abegerit suo odio; Aul. 656, hunc si amitto, hic abierit; Merc. 140, at edepol tu calidam picem bibito; aegritudo abscesserit; similarly 372; 389; Most. 711, abitus tuos tibi, senex, fecerit male; so also Poen. 886; Rud. 180; Vid. 36; Pers. 269, verberibus caedi iusserit, compedes impingi; Pseud. 350, nam hunc fames iam occiderit; 573 a, tibicen vos interibi hic delectaverit; Trin. 139, crede huic tutelam; suam rem melius gesserit; 856, conductor de me nugas conciliaverit; Truc. 876, si auferes, a milite omnis spes animam efflaverit; And. 213, si lubitum fuerit, causam ceperit; 381, invenerit aliquam causam; 398, interea aliquid acciderit boni; H. T. 584, hic prius indicarit quam ego argentum effecero; 621, ne ista hercle magno iam conatu magnas nugas dixerit; Phor. 516, hic tibi quod boni promeritus fueris, conduplicaverit; also the following examples with *faxo:* Aul. 578, ego faxo et operam et vinum perdiderit simul; Capt. 801, qui mi opstiterit, faxo vitae is opstiterit suae; Poen. 346, faxo constiterit lymphaticum.

4. Plural forms. These do not occur at all in the first and second persons, while of the third person plural but a single example is noted: Poen. 617, interibi attulerint exta.

As throwing light on the pure future character of the forms above cited, one may instance the frequent occurrence in apparently the same meaning of future and future perfect of the same verb, e.g. Bacch. 610, sed huc concedam; Trin. 1007, lubet observare quid agat; huc concessero; Poen. 805, abscedam hinc intro; Trin. 710, eodem pacto quo huc accessi abscessero; Aul. 176, conveniam Euclionem, si domi est; Cas. 545, post convenero; 547, ubi nuptiae fuerint, tum istam convenibo; Stich. 351, convorre! :: ego fecero; 354, humum consperge ante aedis! :: faciam; Bacch. 95, eo tibi argentum iubebo ecferri; Cas. 613, ego iam per hortum iussero meam transire uxorem; Men. 545, ego post reddidero tibi . . . :: ego post tibi reddam duplex. In all of these passages it seems impossible to detect any difference between the force of the future and that of the future perfect.

Cramer (Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, iv, p. 595), following G. Hermann, seems to advocate the recognition of a difference of meaning wherever we have different forms of speech. But if there be a difference of force between the tenses in the forms just cited, no one has ever stated it. It is in fact extremely doubtful whether Hermann's dictum is more than a half truth. In view of the not uncommon equivalence of different forms of expression in modern languages, it seems methodically superfluous to insist on a difference in the ancient languages under similar conditions. If the difference exists and is tangible, it should be recognized and stated; but we are under no necessity of attempting to distinguish differences that do not exist.

In addition to the foregoing examples of the parallel use of the future and future perfect of the same verb, it may serve also to cite instances of the use of the future and future perfect of different verbs in the same passage. Thus: Amph. 930, ibo egomet; comitem mihi Pudicitiam duxero; As. 280, erum in obsidione linquet, inimicum animos auxerit; Cas. 780, vos tamen cenabitis, cena ubi cocta erit; ego ruri cenavero; Men. 544, cedo aurum! ego manupretium dabo. :: da sodes aps te; poste reddidero tibi; Poen. 983, si respondebunt, Punice pergam loqui; si non, tum ad horum mores linguam vortero; Pseud. 332, lanios inde accersam duo, eadem duo greges virgarum ulmearum adegero; Stich. 351, cape illas scopas ! :: capiam. :: hoc egomet, tu hoc convorre. :: ego fecero; 484, ivero . . . loquar; Eun. 723, hac re te omni turba evolves et illi gratum feceris; Phor. 681, inde sumam; uxori tibi opus esse dixero; Hec. 599, et me hac suspicione exsolvam et illis morem gessero; Acc. Praet. 15, patrio exemplo et me dicabo atque animam devoro (= devovero) hostibus.

The use of the future perfect instead of the future seems in many cases to have been encouraged by metrical convenience. The future perfect was especially adapted to the close of the trimeter or the septenarius, and it is there that it occurs with the greatest frequency.

While by origin aoristic ('punktuell'), the future perfect, to judge from the foregoing examples, seems to have lost in a large number of cases its specific aoristic force and to have become indistinguishable from the simple future.

II. The Future Perfect with Future Perfect Force.

The true future perfect force of the future perfect seems to have originated in subordinate clauses, particularly those introduced by conditional particles. Thus in a sentence like Bacch. 49, eadem dedero tibi, ubi biberis, savium, the connection of thought implies that the idea involved in *biberis* is prior to that in *dedero*.[1] In this way a true future perfect force is evolved, and is the regular value of the tense in subordinate clauses. By a natural transference it appears also in principal clauses, though the pure future meaning is in Early Latin very much commoner. Illustrations of the future perfect meaning are seen in the following:

1. In principal clauses unaccompanied by a dependent clause. This type is rare. Examples: Men. 521, faxo haud inultus prandium comederis; Epid. 282, iam igitur amota erit omnis consultatio; Phor. 888, nam idem hoc argentum, ita ut datumst, ingratiis ei datum erit. Epid. 298, occupatum erit; Most. 235, iam ista quidem apsumpta res erit, cited by Sjögren as true future perfects, do not seem to me clear cases. In both instances *erit* is future and the participle has adjective force. Men. 295, perieris, regarded by Sjögren as future perfect, I take (with Brugmann, Kurze Vergl. Gramm., p. 570) as an optative subjunctive.

2. In principal clauses which are accompanied by a dependent clause: Pseud. 629, dum tu sternuas, res soluta erit; 640, si dare vis mihi, magis erit solutum; Trin. 783, ubi thensaurum ecfoderis, suspicionem ab adulescente amoveris; Pers. 402, quod si non dederit atque hic dies praeterierit, ego argentum, ille ius iurandum amiserit; Men. 54, nam nisi qui argentum dederit, nugas egerit; Poen. 81, nisi qui dederit, nugas egerit; qui dederit, magis maiores nugas egerit; Capt. 695, si istuc faxis, haud sine poena feceris; M. G. 573, nec videris quod videris; Most. 210, ille te nisi amabit ultro, id pro tuo capite quod dedit perdiderit; Rud. 1135, si falsa dicam, frustra dixero; Pseud. 512, si abstuleris, mirum et magnum facinus feceris; 531, si istaec opera perfeceris, virtute regi Agathocli antecesseris; H. T. 478, si tuom animum intellexerit, quantam fenestram ad nequitiem patefe-

[1] Cf. also Brugmann, Kurze vergleichende Grammatik, p. 571, who suggests that pluperfects in -*eram* (denoting a prior past act) may have helped the future perfect to develop the notion of a prior *future* act.

ceris! Ad. 232, si hoc omitto, refrixerit res.   The foregoing are the surest examples of the future perfect used with future perfect force. Possibly some scholars may see even in these passages only a future use.

The So-called 'Shifted' Future Perfect.[1]

In his Historische Syntax der lat. Sprache, iii, p. 189 ff., Blase recognizes a 'shifted' ('verschobenes') future perfect. His reasoning is as follows: Just as *fui* often means, 'I am no longer,' so *fuerit* should have meant 'he will no longer be.'   But as a matter of fact numerous instances occur where *fuerit* cannot have this meaning, but clearly has the future force of *erit*.   Such uses represent the 'shifted' function.   Without going into the details of Sjögren's refutation of this view, I will here content myself with referring the reader to his discussion, which seems to me to show conclusively the untenability of Blase's position.   The relatively few instances of the use recognized by Blase have already been classified under the use of the future perfect as future.   Blase confines the use to *fuerit*, and a very limited number of other words, e.g. *habuero* (Cas. 787) and *placuero* (Men. 670).

Future Perfect as Imperative.

In Bacch. 49, eadem biberis, and M. G. 572, quod scies nesciveris, nec videris quod videris; the future perfect has imperative force.

[1] See especially Sjögren, p. 173 ff., for a criticism of Blase's view.

CHAPTER III.

THE INDICATIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.[1]

PARATAXIS.

Probably the earliest form of the conditional period consisted simply of two paratactic indicatives; cf. Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 580. Yet traces of this are not frequent in Early Latin. The only examples that are at all clear are: Most. 873, boni sunt, bonust (Bergk's conj.); inprobi sunt, malus fit (*improbis sunt, malus fuit*, codd.; *fit* is Cam.'s conj.); Pseud. 863, si iste ibit, ito; stabit, astato simul; Stat. 5, actutum, voltis, emptast; noltis, non emptast; Com. Incert. R. p. 142, tutare amici causam, partis suscipe! Obicitur crimen capitis; purga fortiter (*p* . . . . codd.); Eun. 252, negat quis, nego; ait, aio. The other examples cited by Rothheimer, op. cit. p. 12, and Brugmann, op. cit. p. 30, ftn., do not seem to me to belong here.

CLASSIFICATION OF INDICATIVE PROTASES.

I. Protasis In Present Indicative.

Protases in the present indicative fall into two classes, according as the reference is to present or future time.

A. PROTASIS IN PRESENT INDICATIVE REFERRING TO PRESENT TIME OR DENOTING A GENERAL TRUTH.

1. The apodosis is also in the present indicative (293), referring usually to present time, but occasionally to the future.

a) Introduced by *si* (209), e.g. Amph. 1105, si istaec vera sunt, non metuo; As. 242, si adfers, tum patent; Merc. 185, ego nugor, si

---

[1] Rothheimer, De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis, 1876; Liebig, Die hypothetischen Sätze bei Terenz, 1863; Lindskog, de enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium condicionalibus; O. Brugmann, Gebrauch des condicionalen NI in der älteren Latinität, 1887; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 580 ff.; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, p. 43.

respondeo? And. 973, salvos sum, si haec vera sunt; H. T. 105, erras, si credis; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, si inpluit, fieri solet.

b) Introduced by *si modo.* Only Most. 927, sat sapio, si modo caveo; Trin. 1182, bene re gesta salvos redeo, si tu modo frugi esse vis.

c) Introduced by *nisi* (31), e.g. As. 108, eo ad forum nisi quid vis; Men. 1082, nisi animus me fallit, hi sunt gemini; Trin. 439, nequam illud verbum est, nisi qui bene facit; H. T. 614, nisi me animus fallit, hic profectost anulus; Enn. Ann. 330, non est victor, nisi victus fatetur; Amph. 902; Aul. 579; Bacch. 651; 654; Capt. 88; Cas. 731; Poen. 190; 232; And. 950; H. T. 935.

d) Introduced by *nisi si* (6): Amph. 825, nescio quid dicam, nisi si quispiamst alius Amphitruo; Curc. 51, pudica est, nisi si est osculando impudicior; Cato, Agr. 138, asinis feriae nullae, nisi si in familia sunt; Men. 247; Most. 769; Pers. 833.

e) Introduced by *nisi forte.* Only Stich. 356, quid sit nil scio, nisi forte hospites venturi sunt.

f) Introduced by *si non* (21), e.g. Amph. 438, quis sum, si non sum Sosia? Aul. 207, salvom est, si quid non perit; Capt. 81, suo sibi suco vivont, si ros non cadit; And. 237, quid est, si haec non contumeliast? H. T. 666, non licet, si res non sinit; Cist. 297; Curc. 400; Ep. 460; Most. 770; Pers. 578; Trin. 1062; Eun. 35; Ad. 733.

g) Introduced by *ni :* Poen. 286, non potis est fieri, ni sumptus sequitur; Enn. Ann. 371 a, ni metus tenet, quiescunt.

h) Introduced by *si minus:* M. G. 876, minus si tenetis, denuo volo percipiatis; Lucil. 145, si minus delectat, non operam perdo.

i) Introduced by *si nihil, si nusquam:* Pers. 585, si tibi subiti nihil est, tantundem est; Pseud. 845, si nusquam is coctum, quidnam cenat?

j) Introduced by *sin* (12), e.g. Men. 579, sin dives malust, frugi habetur; Merc. 589, sin foris sum, animus domist; M. G. 889, sin bene faciundumst, deveniunt obliviosae; H. T. 45, sin lenis est, ad alium defertur gregem; Pers. 454; Stich. 521; Eun. 104; Hec. 255; 780.

k) Introduced by *si . . . sive (seu)* (5): Rud. 629, te oro, si speras seu confidis . . . ut ne pigeat; Truc. 833, si bibit sive adeo caret temeto; And. 216; Cist. 645. *Sive* alone: And. 190.

2. **The apodosis stands in the imperfect indicative:** As. 452, sed si domist, volebam; Phor. 1023, iam tum erat senex, senectus si vere-cundos facit; in both of which the expression is obviously elliptical; Enn. Trag. 115, si improbum esse Chrespontem existumas, cur me huic locabas nuptiis?

3. **The apodosis stands in the future indicative (70).**

a) With *si* (58): particularly in the formulas *si vis, si voltis, si sapis*, as: Amph. 54, si voltis, faciam; As. 453; 654; Aul. 155; 401, tu si sapis, reddes; Cas. 780; 838; Capt. 269, si frugist, admutilabit; 897, aeternum tibi dapinabo victum, si vera autumas; Cas. 998; Cist. 682; And. 737; H. T. 334.

b) With *nisi:* And. 670, alia adgrediemur, nisi putas; H. T. 668, nisi me animus fallit, haud multum a me aberit infortunium.

c) With *si non* (3): Most. 1131, ego ibo, si tibi non lubet; Poen. 371; H. T. 995.

d) With *sin* (4): Epid. 545, sin east quam autumo, congrediar; Trin. 715; 1064; Ad. 492.

e) With *sed si* (3): As. 281, sed si studet, pariet; Hec. 397; Ad. 603.

4. **The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (16).**

a) With *si* (12), e.g. Stich. 398, provenisti futile, si neque adest neque subvenit; Phor. 296, si cognatast maxume, non fuit necesse habere; Naev. Trag. 7. Frequent is the occurrence of *perii, occidi*, or *actum est* in such apodoses; e.g. Epid. 510; Most. 963; And. 465.

b) With *nisi* (3): Pseud. 1213, nisi mirumst, perdidisti; so Stat. 255; Trin. 458, nisi aliud vis, respondi.

c) With *sin:* Hec. 559, sin est ut nolit, recte consului.

5. **The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative:** Capt. 309, hoc te monitum, nisi forte non vis, volueram.

6. **The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (4):** M. G. 298, si verum est, periveris; Poen. 442, si nequeo facere, abiero; Trin. 607, si hoc non credis, ego credidero; Poen. 80; Pseud. 640.

7. **The apodosis is an independent subjunctive, hortatory, optative, etc. (34).**

a) Hortatory (2): Merc. 578, si censes, arripiamus; Ad. 601.

b) Jussive (19). With *si* (15), e.g. Capt. 63, si quis exspectat, litis contrahat; M. G. 1037, adeat, si quid volt; Eun. 5; Phor. 12;

Ad. 514 si is est, faciat; Afran. 355. — With *si non*, Poen. 24, si id facere non queunt, domum abeant! — With *sin* (4): Phor. 925, sin est ut velit, dos hic maneat! Hec. 502; 637; Ad. 515.

c) Permissive (3): As. 460, ne duit, si non volt; Bacch. 90, tu nullus adfueris, si non lubet; Epid. 584.

d) Optative (6): Pseud. 272, si dignu's, neque ament neque faciant! Rud. 569, Iupiter te perdat, et si sunt et si non sunt; Trin. 992; Hec. 102, ita di faxint, si in rem est Bacchidis; Bacch. 505, mihi numquam creduat, ni illam — amo; Ad. 700, di me oderint, ni te amo.

e) Potential (5): Aul. 747, si istuc ius est, deripiamus; Phor. 656, si volt, nullam malim dari; Rud. 744, tanta esset, si vivit; Bacch. 914, si non est, nolis esse.

8. The apodosis is an imperative, usually present, but sometimes future (123).

a) With *si* (99): e.g. XII Tab. 1, si in ius vocat, ito; ibid. si calvitur pedemve struit, manum endo iacito! ibid. 4; 5; As. 354, si erum vis, adduce; Bacch. 870, illoc pacisce, si potest; Rud. 1177, hunc si potes, fer intro; And. 546, si in remst, iube! As. 645; 701; Aul. 161; Bacch. 998; 1025; Capt. 219; 603; 893; 978; H. T. 1031; 1051; Eun. 106; Phor. 197; 387; 527.

b) With *si modo:* only Truc. 890, sine, si is est modo.

c) With *nisi* (13): e.g. Bacch. 1118, iube aperiri fores, nisi mavoltis comminui; Men. 992, facite illic homo ablatus siet, nisi vos nihili penditis; 1066; M. G. 182; H. T. 880, desine, nisi iudicas; Eun. 796, Pamphilam redde, nisi mavis; Ad. 806.

d) With *si non* (5): Men. 534, redde, si non meministi; And. 327, si id non potest, saltem aliquot dies profer! 692; Eun. 503; Phor. 994.

e) With *si minus:* only Truc. 900, si minus (*mihi,* codd.) credis, respice.

f) With *ni, nive:* Cas. 75, id ni fit, mecum pignus dato; Epid. 700, ni matris filiast, in meum nummum pignus da! Pers. 186, da pignus, ni omnia memini et scio et si scis; Rud. 712, habe iudicem, si tuas esse oportet nive eas esse oportet liberas neu te in carcerem compingi aequom est. For a discussion of the origin of the use of *ni, nive* in sentences of this kind, see Bennett, Transactions of Amer. Philol. Assoc., xxxi, p. 242 ff.

9. Type *quid si* (10), e.g. Cist. 273, quid si amo? Merc. 890, quid si mi animus fluctuat? Rud. 1086; Phor. 661, quid si animam debet? — *Quid si non:* Pers. 613, quid si non volt? Asin. 195; Poen. 722.

10. Verb of protasis understood from the context (4): Amph. 446, si tergum cicatricosum, nil hoc similist similius; M. G. 631; Stich. 521; Phor. 211.

11. *Mirum ni* (7) *mira sunt ni* (2) *mirum si* (2): Cas. 554, mirum ni subolet; Amph. 319; And. 598; H. T. 663; Eun. 344; Pseud. 1216, mira sunt, ni Pseudolust; so Trin. 861; Truc. 305, nil mirum lateres si ruont; And. 755, mirum si facit.

12. The apparent apodosis is not the logical apodosis, which is under-stood (14), e.g. Amph. 427, si tu Sosia's, quid fecisti? i.e. 'If you are S., then tell me what you did!' Similarly Amph. 1024, sum Sosia, nisi me esse oblitum existumas; Epid. 448, quem quaeris, ego sum, si quid vis; Merc. 767; Most. 1075; Poen. 1047; Phor. 1023, iam tum erat senex, senectus si verecundos facit; Men. 566.

13. There is no formal apodosis, but one is suggested by the context (28).

a) With *si* (19), e.g. Curc. 672, quid cessas dare? :: si haec volt; Most. 986, amburet ei misero corculum carbunculus. :: si quidem istaec vera sunt; Poen. 311, suspende te! :: si quidem tu es mecum futurus; Pseud. 877; Eun. 76, itane suades? :: si sapis; 410.

b) With *nisi* (5): Curc. 82, eine sinus fertur? :: nisi nevis; Men. 787; M. G. 185; Most. 807; Trin. 1156.

c) With *nisi si:* And. 249, quam ob rem (repetor), nisi si id est quod suspicor? Eun. 160.

d) With *sin* (2): Pseud. 253, non lubet. :: sin tuamst in rem; Trin. 47.

14. The apodosis consists not of a verb, but of some other part of speech (9).

a) With *si* (7): e.g. Asin. 384, ohe, si quid audis; M. G. 649, O lepidum senem, si habet; Poen. 207, em amores tuos, si vis spectare; Ad. 992, sed si voltis, ecce me qui id faciam.

b) With *sin:* Merc. 143, sin saluti quod tibi esse censeo, id con-suadeo; Pers. 227, sin te amo? In these last two the apodosis con-sists of the adversative element contained in *sin.*

15. Aposiopesis (5).

a) With *si* (3): And. 790, si pol Glycerio non omnia haec —; Ad. 137, si obsto . . . em desino; 969.

b) With *sin:* Epid. 543, sin est homo; Cas. 981.

16. The phrase *si dis placet* (4). This is not properly a protasis, but has become purely formulaic. Capt. 454, expedivi, si dis placet; Truc. 647; Eun. 919; Ad. 476.

B. PROTASES IN PRESENT INDICATIVE REFERRING TO FUTURE TIME.

1. The apodosis also stands in the present indicative, and, like the protasis, usually refers to future time (68).

a) With *si* (34), e.g. Asin. 320, si obtines, salvi sumus; Capt. 446, satin habes, si refero? Cas. 338, melius res tibi habet tua, si impetramus; 955; Curc. 328, invenire possum, si mi operam datis; 374; Men. 126, si foris cenat, me ulciscitur; Stich. 535, si conficio, transeo; And. 244, si fit, pereo; H. T. 930, si pergo, ad rastros res redit; Phor. 604; 856.

b) With *nisi* (26), e.g. Cas. 715, eo nunciam, nisi remorare; Epid. 83, nisi suffulcis firmiter, non potes supsistere; Men. 150, non pergo, nisi scio; Most. 539, manufesta res est, nisi quid occurro; Pseud. 70, vastities venit, nisi in test salus; 381; H. T. 669, in angustum meae coguntur copiae, nisi aliquid video; Phor. 179; Ad. 231.

c) With *nisi si:* Capt. 529, nec copia est, nisi si aliquam machinor astutiam.

d) With *si non* (3): Curc. 69, si non adfert, quo me vortam nescio; 373; Pseud. 375.

e) With *ni:* Capt. 103, ni recipit, nihil est quo me vortam; Pseud. 600 a.

f) With *quod si:* Phor. 201, quod si eo meae fortunae redeunt, nullast mihi vita expetenda.

g) With *sin:* And. 210, sin opitulor, huius minas (timeo).

2. The apodosis stands in the future (121).

a) With *si* (61), e.g. Amph. 1005, deludetur, si quidem vos voltis operam dare; Asin. 193, si dantur, dabo; Aul. 489, quo nubent, si istud ius ponitur; 573, te reddam, si vivo; Bacch. 570, si pergis, tollam ted; 766, vorsabo illunc, si vivo; Capt. 331, si reddis, te amittam; 409, si rebito, faciam; 587; Rud. 1125, si tacet, tacebo;

And. 866, si vivo, tibi ostendam; H. T. 696, si abis et Bacchidem relinquis, senex resciscet; Phor. 628; Hec. 112; Ad. 880.

b) With *si modo, modo si :* Amph. 646, id modo si datur mihi, satis esse ducam; Rud. 951, dicam, si fidem modo das.

c) With *nisi* (42), e.g. Amph. 357, faciam te superbum, nisi abis; Asin. 532, nisi adfert xx minas, trudetur; Aul. 644, id fiet, nisi fatere; 759; Bacch. 1147, nisi producuntur, truces erimus; Capt. 593, insectabit, nisi iubes; Cas. 643; 729; Cist. 463; Curc. 575; 718; Rud. 431, nisi oras, non feres; 999; 1004; 1289; And. 776, nisi tollis, hunc provolvam; H. T. 33, plura dicet, nisi finem facit; 730; 932; 1003; Eun. 803; Ad. 173.

d) With *si non* (6): Amph. 929, si non iubes, ibo egomet; M. G. 268, si non reperio, ibo; 920; Stich. 646; And. 208, si non providentur, me pessum dabunt; Lucil. 559.

e) With *ni* (10), e.g. Amph. 440, vapulabis, ni abis; Asin. 474, crura diffringentur, ni percies; 670; 706; Bacch. 858, ni exsolvor, hominem opprimet; Curc. 723; Rud. 1009; Truc. 286.

3. **The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (25).** The most frequent form of the apodosis is *perii, interii, occidi,* or some similar locution.

a) With *si* (7), e.g. Asin. 360, si adfert, nos exclusi sumus; Merc. 530, animus rediit, si mecum servatur fides; 593; M. G. 306, si indicium facio, interii; Poen. 915; Ad. 458, si deseris tu, periimus.

b) With *nisi* (15), e.g. Asin. 287, perii, nisi Libanum invenio: Capt. 539, occisa est res, nisi reperio; 749; Cist. 671; Epid. 82, nisi quid auxili est, apsumptus es; M. G. 295; 828; Rud. 683, nisi quid apparas, acta haec res est; 1415; Vid. 66; And. 642.

c) With *si non :* Asin. 243, interii, si non invenio.

d) With *ni :* Asin. 918, ni impetro, regem perdidi; Stich. 401, ni expello, occidi.   •

4. **The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (5).**

a) With *si* (4): Aul. 656, hunc si amitto, hic abierit; Capt. 296, si confiteri vis, ex tua re feceris; M. G. 297; Ad. 127, si pergis, abiero.

b) With *si non :* H. T. 107, si id non facis, invenero.

5. **The apodosis stands in the imperative (25).**

a) With *si* (15), e.g. Asin. 383, si est intus, evocato; Men. 1093, liber esto, si invenis; M. G. 255; Pers. 659, age, si quid agis (so frequently); Poen. 1237 ; Cato, Agr. 157, 10, si dolent, lavito.

b) With *nisi:* Curc. 535, nisi properas dare, vitam propera ponere; Phor. 988, nisi sequitur, pugnos in ventrem ingere.

c) With *si non* (3): Men. 199, si non saltas, exue; M. G. 1394, si non sequitur, rapite sublimem; Cato, Agr. 2, 2.

d) With *ni* (5): XII Tab. 1, ni it, antestamino; ibid. ni pacunt, caussam coiciunto; 3, ni iudicatum facit, secum ducito; ibid. ni suo vivit, dato; 8, ni testimonium fariatur, inprobus esto.

6. The apodosis is a jussive subjunctive. Only Cato, Agr. 2, 1, eodem die si potest, circumeat!

7. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive (4): And. 528, si impetro, quid malim? Ad. 531; Cato, fr. Jord. 27, 5, si volo augurium optime tenere, ecquis me ob eam rem augurem capiat? Pers. 370, at si non licet, quid agam?

8. Type *quid si* (7): Amph. 849, quid si adduco tuom cognatum? Bacch. 1184; Cas. 269; 270; Men. 844, quid si servos cito? H. T. 719, quid si redeo? Phor. 210.

9. The apodosis is either a verb to be understood from the context, or is contained in some other part of speech (8): Pseud. 519, mortalem graphicum, si servat fidem; Truc. 923, malo tuo, nisi ego aliqui gaudeo; Amph. 793, cum cruciatu, nisi apparet, tuo; Asin. 471; H. T. 331, quid aliud vis? :: siquidem hoc fit; Phor. 805, numquamne concedes mihi? :: si tu nil narras? 492, sin fidem do? Cato, Agr. 136.

10. Aposiopesis (4): And. 516, nisi fit . . .; Eun. 990, si vivo . . .; Ad. 135; Phor. 937.

II. Protasis in the Imperfect Indicative.

a) With *si* (9): Asin. 143, ea si erant, magnas habebas omnibus dis gratias; M. G. 1326, nil miror, si lubenter hic eras; Poen. 526, si properabas, magis, pridie nos huc duxisse oportuit; Pseud. 286, si amabas, invenires; 798, si arbitrabare, cur conducebas? 800, cur sedebas, si eras coquos? Truc. 748, si volebas, auferres dimidium domum; Turp. 21, si flabat Aquilo, inopia tum erat piscati; Cato, fr. Jord. 83, 3, si quis in ea re studebat, aut sese ad convivia adplicabat, grassator vocabatur.

b) With *nisi:* Stich. 130, nisi placebant, non datas oportuit.

c) With *si minus:* Phor. 361, nihil est quod suscenseam, si illum minus norat.

III. Protasis in the Future Indicative.

1. The apodosis stands in the present indicative (34), which usually refers to the future.

a) With *si* (30), e.g. Bacch. 911, satin est, si plura audiet? Capt. 209, si erit occasio, haud dehortor; 625, si secus reperies, nullam causam dico; Epid. 37, modo videndum est, si dabit; Merc. 526; M. G. 249, sed si volet, quid agimus? 694; Eun. 382, an id flagitiumst, si deducar et fallam? Ad. 347, si infitias ibit, testis mecum est anulus; Cato, Agr. 3, 4, fieri potest, si facies; 14, 1; 43, 1, si erit, oportet; 157, 7, purgat, si edes.

b) With *nisi*: Men. 694, nisi feres argentum, me ductare non potes; Trin. 919.

c) With *si non:* Trin. 793, si non feret, dici non potest.

d) With *ni:* Rud. 578, an te paenitet, ni eluam?

2. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (115).

a) With *si* (100), e.g. Asin. 109, si quid te volam, ubi eris? 237; 597, si voles, manebo; Bacch. 1001, non dabis, si sapies; Capt. 196, si id facietis, levior labos erit; 497; Epid. 647, si quid erit dubium, inmutabo; Merc. 207; M. G. 195, istaec, si erit hic, nuntiabo; 1239; 1365; Rud. 417; 788; 1401; Trin. 300, si mea imperia capesses, multa bona consident; And. 920, si perget, audiet; H. T. 217; 748; 872, domi ero, si quid me voles; Phor. 359; Ad. 565, continebit, si sapiet, manus; Cato, Agr. 1, 7, si me rogabis, sic dicam; 4, si videbit, facilius vendes; 5, 2; 157, 6; 158, 2, si voles, licebit; Liv. And. Trag. 1, si imitabo, tum tu pretium pro noxa dabis.

b) With *nisi* (11), e.g. Capt. 179, nisi qui meliorem (condicionem) adferet, me addicam; Cas. 123, nisi erunt semper plena, te implebo; Men. 662, numquam introibis, nisi feres; M. G. 450; Pers. 430; Poen. 14; Trin. 612; Ad. 454, nisi facient, haud sic auferent.

c) With *si non* (3): M. G. 1240, si non quibo, consciscam letum; Pseud. 555; And. 700.

d) With *si neminem:* Pseud. 120, si neminem alium potero, tangam patrem.

e) With *ni:* Rud. 753, ni offerumentas habebis pluris, tum ero mendacissimus.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative: Eun. 51, si incipies, actumst; 717, actumst, siquidem me ludificabere.

4. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (13).

a) With *si* (10), e.g. Capt. 695, hau sine poena feceris, si rebitet; 968; M. G. 1243, te vilem feceris, si te ultro largiere; Pseud. 949; Trin. 279; And. 397, sed si te aequo animo ferre accipiet, neclegentem feceris; Ad. 817.

b) With *nisi:* Most. 210, nisi amabit, quod dedit perdiderit; Stich. 62.

5. The apodosis stands in the imperative (116). This form of conditional sentence is especially common in Cato's De Agr., in which two thirds of all the examples occur.

a) With *si* (96), e.g. XII Tab. 3, si volet, suo vivito; ibid. 1, si nolet, arceram ne sternito; 3, si volet, plus dato; Leg. Reg. ii, 2, si tanget, (*tangit*, Gell. iv, 3, 3), agnum caedito; Asin. 165, ductato, si dabis; Aul. 94, dicito, si quis petet; 340; Capt. 114, sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent; Cas. 146; Epid. 264, si placebit, utitor; 658; Stich. 148, si veniet nuntius, facito ut sciam; And. 863, si invenies, occidito; H. T. 865, si voles, dicito; 972; Eun. 596; 768; Hec. 76, si quaeret, dicito; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, stramenta si deerunt, frondem legito; 9, si habebis, facito; 18, 1, si voles, componito; 18, 9; 22, 1; 24; 54, 4; 64, 2; 99; 108; 112; 132, 2; 156, 1; 157, 16; Pacuv. 341, me occide, si probitam.

b) With *si non* (16), e.g. Epid. 264, si non placebit, reperitote rectius; Eun. 503, si id non poterit, ad me adducito; Cato, Agr. 9, si non habebis, facito; 18, 5, duplices indito, si solidas non habebis; 43, 1, si lapis non erit, consternito; 54, 2; 93; 146, 3, si non reddet, aequom solvito; 151, 4, si quando non pluet, inrigato; 157, 9; CIL i, 199, 25, sei Langenses eam pequniam non dabunt, tum debento.

c) With *si minus:* Cato, Agr. 141, 4, si minus in omnes litabit, sic verba concipito.

d) With *sin:* Rud. 815, sin ipse abitere hinc volet, amplectitote; Enn. Trag. 301, sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito.

e) With *sive:* Cato, Agr. 52, 2, sive calix erit, conquassato.

6. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (12):

a) With *si* (11), e.g. M. G. 936, hoc si efficiam, quid tibi mittam?

Poen. 1409, si reddes, compingare; Pers. 786, ut non cogam, si vivam? Eun. 441, si quando illa dicet, Pamphilam cantatum provocemus; Hec. 78, si quaeret, uti dicas; Cato, Agr. 1, 3, si poteris, sub radice montis siet; 144, 4, si volent, iurent; 146, 3; 156, 6; Lucil. 809, pistricem validam, si nummi suppeditabunt, addas.

b) With *si non:* Hec. 79, si non quaeret, nullus dixeris.

7. Type *quid si* (6): Amph. 392, quid si falles? Merc. 908, quid si optabo? Most. 582; H. T. 676; Phor. 320; Hec. 442.

8. The verb of the protasis is understood (6):

a) With *si* (3): And. 713, at tamen, si quid; ibid. veniam, si quid; Eun. 889, tamen si pater quid?

b) With *si non:* Poen. 984, si non, tum vortero (*si respondebunt* has preceded); Cato, Agr. 157, 9, si non, dato panem purum (*si poterit* has preceded).

c) With *sin secus:* Cas. 377, sin secus, patiemur aequis animis (*si illuc quod volumus eveniet* has preceded).

9. The apodosis is either a verb to be supplied from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech (8).

a) With *si* (7): Eun. 443, si laudabit illius formam, tu huius contra (sc. lauda); Ad. 539, si quid rogabit, nusquam tu me; Cato, Agr. 22, 4, si orbes parabis, medios crassos pedem unum; 43; 61, 2; 136.

b) With *si non:* Cato, Agr. 126, ad tormina, et si alvos non consistet, et si lumbrici erunt.

c) With *si modo:* Trin. 1187, dicis; si facies modo.

10. *Mirum ni:* Eun. 230, mirum ni me turpiter hic dabo.

11. Aposiopesis (4): Phor. 51, si quis me quaeret; 319; Hec. 765; M. G. 527, si non videbit.

IV. Protasis in the Perfect Indicative.

1. The apodosis stands in the present indicative (73). The perfect indicative of the protasis is regularly a present perfect.

a) With *si* (57), e.g. Amph. 853, si deliqui, nulla causa est; Asin. 224, si papillam contrectavit, haud est ab re; Bacch. 192, si illa inventast, vivit; 528; Capt. 117, si datast occasio, satis est; 195; Merc. 774, si quid evenit, non est mea culpa; 821; Pseud. 905, si umquam di voluere, tum me servatum volunt; Rud. 192; And.

504, si occepi, censes; 572; Phor. 273, si quis fecit, nostran culpa est? Hec. 552; Ad. 976, si dedit, haud dubiumst quin aequom siet; Cato, fr. Jord. 42, 6; Turp. 175, miserum puto, si etiam istuc accessit.

b) With *nisi* (5): Amph. 765, demiror qui sciat, nisi convenisti; M. G. 272, nisi ambulavi dormiens, certo scio; 638; Most. 953; Pers. 838.

c) With *nisi si* (4): Truc. 669, mirum videtur non rediisse, nisi si conlapsus est; H. T. 391, nisi si prospectum aliquid est, desertae vivimus; Eun. 661; Ad. 594, officium facio, nisi si me in illo credidisti esse numero. This last and possibly the first belong only formally under this head, the logical apodosis being understood.

d) With *ni:* Pers. 839, nec sat honestus, ni id ecfecit; Rud. 1070.

e) With *si non:* Asin. 907, si non didicisti, non mirandumst; Bacch. 193, si non inventast, minus valet; Cas. 306.

f) With *si minus:* M. G. 602, surripitur, si minus cum cura locus lectus est.

g) With *si neque* (= *si non*): Cato, Agr. 141, 4, si quid tibi neque satisfactum est, te piaculo.

h) With *sed si = sin:* Rud. 193, sed si curavi, tum hoc indecore datis. *Si me impiavi* has preceded.

2. The apodosis stands in the future indicative (6).

a) With *si* (4): Epid. 362, uno modo persuadebit, si illam adempsit Orcus; Eun. 924, quod si astu rem tractavit, quantam laudem capiet Parmeno? Cato, Agr. 157, 4.

b) With *nisi:* Pseud. 178, nisi penus convenit, prostituam vos.

c) With *si parum:* Rud. 1103, si parum intellexti, denuo dicam.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (17).

a) With *si* (16), e.g. Amph. 817, quid deliqui, si tecum fui? Asin. 272; 942; Cas. 997, si feci, feci nequiter; Epid. 91; 630; Pseud. 910, interii, si ille abiit; Truc. 43; H. T. 631, si peccavi, insciens feci; Eun. 27; Hec. 709, non mirum fecit, si hoc aegre tulit.

b) With *sin:* Merc. 594, sin fecit, non abiit salus.

4. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (10).

a) With *si* (8), e.g. Cas. 246, di me infelicent, si in os meum vini guttam indidi; Asin. 537, si animus occupatust, quid faciam? Ad. 690, si te puduit, qua resciscerem? Asin. 770, si quem aspexit, caeca siet; Aul. 645, di me perdant, si quicquam abstuli; M. G. 833.

b) With *si non:* Amph. 572, merito maledicas mi, si non id ita factumst.

c) With *si nemo:* Cist. 683, si nemo praeteriit, hic iaceret.

5. **The apodosis stands in the imperative (16).**

a) With *si* (13), e.g. XII Tab. 3, si plus minusve secuerunt, se fraude esto; ibid. 8; 12; Aul. 396, confige fures, si (*cui* codd.) sub-venisti antidhac; Cas. 3, si verum dixi, signum date; Poen. 1320; Hec. 253, siquid est peccatum, profer; Ad. 184; Cato, Agr. 157, 4, luxatum si quid est, foveto; Naev. Com. 13, si unquam quicquam feci, carnificem cedo.

b) With *nisi:* Ad. 483, extorque, nisi ita factumst; Cato, Agr. 144, 2.

c) With *si numquam:* H. T. 48, si numquam statui et in animum induxi, exemplum statuite in me.

6. **Type *mirum est ni (nisi)* (7):** Capt. 824, mirum est ni fecere; 805, mira sunt ni sumpsit; so Bacch. 450; Amph. 432; Amph. 283, mira sunt nisi invitavit; Poen. 839, mira sunt nisi erus hunc here-dem fecit; Stat. 101, mirum nisi frater turbam aliquam dedit.

7. **Type *quid si* (5):** Epid. 599, quid si servo aliter visum est? Pseud. 539; Eun. 875, quid si hoc quispiam voluit deus? Amph. 701; Pseud. 286, quid si non habui?

8. **Various idiomatic forms.**

a) Expressions of which Amph. 457, an egomet me reliqui, si forte oblitus fui, is the type.   Similarly Most. 941, nihil ad me attinet? : : nisi forte factu's praefectus novos; Epid. 22, ubi is ergost? nisi si in vidulo attulisti; Poen. 514, nisi cum pedicis condidicistis grassari; Cas. 637, timeo quid sit, nisi se percussit flore Liberi.

b) The apodosis is either understood from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech: Cas. 305, si id factum est, ecce me nullum senem; Rud. 776, maxumo malo suo, si attigerit sive occeptassit.

c) The perfect indicative of the protasis is equivalent to a future perfect: Most. 827, satis boni sunt, si sunt inducti pice.

V. Protasis in the Pluperfect Indicative.

The pluperfect indicative in the protasis of conditional sentences is extremely rare. The only examples I have noted are: Aul. 427, quid tibi erat negoti, nisi iusseram? Bacch. 423, nisi in palaestram veneras, poenas penderes; Phor. 400, id si falsum fuerat, quor non fefellit? Hec. 181, si quando ad eam accesserat, fugere; Cato, Frag. Jord. 35, 3, si quis strenue fecerat, donabam. In the last two examples *si* has a pronounced temporal force.

VI. Protasis in the Future Perfect Indicative.

1. **The apodosis stands in the present indicative (39), which often has future force.**

a) With *si* (23), e.g. Asin. 154, non potest auferre, si quis venerit; Bacch. 364, si ero reprehensus, macto illum infortunio; Cist. 147, si usus venerit, meminisse vos volo; Curc. 85; 555; H. T. 437, pessume consulis, si ostenderis; Phor. 347, si sustinueris, ludas licet; 579; Cato, Agr. 157, 10, si quando usus venerit, potest.

b) With *nisi* (9), e.g. Asin. 94, quoi nil est, nisi defrudaveris; Poen. 1208, nisi faxint, qui sperem haud scio; Pseud. 100, nisi dacrumis fleveris argenteis, non refert; 781; And. 565, qui scis, nisi periclum feceris?

c) With *ni:* Men. 471, non is sum qui sum, ni hanc iniuriam ultus fuero.

d) With *nisi si:* Eun. 901, non credo, nisi si commissum non erit; Pacuv. 7, non intellegimus, nisi si aperte dixeris.

e) With *si non:* Aul. 250, si non dedero, impero; Pseud. 533, si non faxis, numquid causaest?

f) With *si . . . seu; sive . . . sive:* Merc. 311, si movero me seu secari sensero, auctor sum ut me enices; Cato, Agr. 139, sive ego sive quis meo iussu fecerit, precor.

2. **The apodosis stands in the future indicative (159).**

a) With *si* (133), e.g. Asin. 370, illum oblectabo, si advenerit; 837, credam, si videro; Capt. 124, si faxis, te in caveam dabo; 809; M. G. 701, si amiseris libertatem, haud facile restitues; 859; Rud. 1083, suppetias feret, si dederit; And. 773, si viderit, non dabit; H. T. 698, si abduxeris, celabitur; Eun. 299; Phor. 637, si dixeris,

tria non commutabitis verba; Cato, Agr. 5, 5, si fecerit, scibit; 94; 148, 2; Enn. Trag. 224, si offendero, moriere; Porc. Licin. Baehr. p. 279, si attigero, incendam omnem silvam; Lucil. 660.

b) With *quod si:* H. T. 724, quod si me deceperit, frustra veniet.

c) With *nisi* (11), e.g. Asin. 487, numquam feres, nisi iusserit; 817; Capt. 724, nisi confeceris, nomen indetur tibi; Epid. 728, numquam, nisi orassis, solves; Men. 256, nisi revorteris, gemes; Pers. 218; Phor. 220, ego plectar, nisi quid me fefellerit; Naev. Com. 8, eos vendam, nisi tu viceris.

d) With *si non* (10): Pseud. 212, si mihi non oleum deportatum erit, te faciam; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, si non caveris, fructum amittes; 144, 3; 144, 5; 147; 148 (ter); Plaut. fr. 74, peribo, si non fecero; Eun. 888.

e) With *ni* (4): M. G. 156, ni diffregeritis talos, vostra faciam latera lorea; Rud. 731; Truc. 624.

f) With *sin:* Phor. 584, sin spreverit, sciet.

3. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (10), which often has future force; *perii* and similar expressions are common in the apodosis.

a) With *si* (7), e.g. Amph. 320, perii, si me aspexerit; 428, victus sum, si dixeris; Men. 416, periisti, si intrassis; Merc. 909; And. 213; Eun. 1064; Phor. 248.

b) With *si nulla:* And. 960, mi immortalitas partast, si nulla aegritudo huic gaudio intercesserit.

c) With *ni:* M. G. 163, disperiistis, ni mulcassitis; Most. 212, perii, ni enicasso.

4. The apodosis stands in the future perfect indicative (18).

a) With *si* (14), e.g. Amph. 198, si dixero mendacium, more meo fecero; Bacch. 363, aufugero, si usus venerit; Capt. 695; Men. 112; Pseud. 376, si attuleris, fidem perdidero; Rud. 1150, si tantillum peccassis, nugas egeris; Trin. 855; And. 213, si lubitum fuerit, causam ceperit; H. T. 478, si intellexerit, quantam fenestram patefeceris! Cato, Agr. 4, si aedificaveris, bene posiveris.

b) With *nisi* (3): Men. 54, nisi dederit, nugas egerit; Most. 1006; Poen. 81.

c) With *si non:* Pers. 402, si non dederit, ius iurandum amiserit.

5. The apodosis is an independent subjunctive (23).

a) With *si* (12): Amph. 672, si situlam cepero, numquam creduis; Asin. 782, si religiosa fuerit, tibi dicat; 854; Cist. 497, di me perdant si duxero; 499; Rud. 789, si te offendero, numquam quisquam me lenonem dixerit; 1383, haud ausim (*aut sim*, codd.), si condemnavero; Cato, Agr. 5, 1, si quis deliquerit, vindicet; 5, 2; si passus erit, ne sinat; 144, 4, si quis fecerit, iurent; 149, 2; Turp. 26, si iceris me posthac, credas mihi velim.

b) With *nisi:* Cist. 522, di faxint, nisi te optruncavero; Most. 193, di me interficiant, nisi illam interfecero.

c) With *ni* (6): Asin. 764, ni abalienarit, tuos arbitratus sit; Bacch. 847; Most. 222; Stich. 191, lumbos diffractos velim, ni vere perierit; Truc. 307.

d) With *si non* (3): Pers. 164, sibi habeat, si non abduxero; Phor. 514, si non dedero, ne oppertus sies; Cato, Agr. 146, 3, si non solverit, solvat.

6. The apodosis stands in the imperative (43).

a) With *si* (35), e.g. XII Tab. 8, si iniuriam faxsit, xxv poenae sunto; ibid. si fraudem fecerit, sacer esto; Leg. Reg. ii, 3 (Fest. p. 178, M), si hominem fulmen Iovis occisit, ne tollito; Asin. 228, remeato, si nactus eris; 231; 371; 800; Men. 156, oculum ecfodito mihi, si ullum verbum faxo; Pseud. 510; And. 752, verbum si faxis, cave; H. T. 550; Eun. 853, si aliam admisero, occidito; Cato, Agr. 44, si quid ventus interfregerit, eximito; 65, 1; 146, 2.

b) With *nisi* (3): Capt. 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; Pseud. 950; Stich. 436.

c) With *ni* (3): XII Tab. 7, ni delapidassint, qua volet iumento agito; M. G. 927, ni ludificata ero, culpam in me imponito; Pseud. 520, servitum me abducito, ni fecero.

d) With *si non:* Poen. 1280, si non ultus fuero, me habento ludificatui; Bacch. 555, si non fecero, me esse dicito ignavissumum.

7. Type *quid si* (7): Asin. 105, quid si in insidias devenero? 720; Cas. 345, quid si sors aliter evenerit? Pseud. 514; Rud. 721; H. T. 718, quid tum si pater resciverit? M. G. 1417, quid si id non faxis?

8. Various idiomatic forms:

a) The apodosis is either a verb to be supplied from the context, or else is contained in some other part of speech: Pers. 579, si quidem hanc vendidero; Poen. 1360, perii. :: immo hau multo post, si

veneris; Pseud. 513, si non apstuleris? Rud. 775, maxumo malo suo, si attigerit sive occeptassit; Trin. 483, non hercle longe, nisi me vicerit; Phor. 440, si quid opus fuerit, heus domo me! Cato, Agr. 110, si demptus erit odor, id optime.

b) The verb of the protasis is omitted: Cato, 110, si non, saepius facito. *Si demptus erit* has preceded.

c) Aposiopesis: Pers. 787, si redierit . . .; Poen. 428; And. 164, quem quidem si sensero; 860; Eun. 1019.

VII. Protases exhibiting a Combination of Two Tenses in Coördination.

The examples I have noted are: Capt. 1034, si placet et si placuimus, signum hoc mittite; Pseud. 143, nisi animum advortetis, nisi somnum exmovetis, faciam; Truc. 40, itidem est, amator si dedit atque est benignus; And. 41, si quid feci aut facio, habeo gratiam; Hec. 560, siquidem non volt et tu sensti, aderam; Ad. 232, si hoc omitto ac tum agam, nil est; 979, processisti pulchre. : : siquidem tu officium facies atque dederis.

Dependent Conditional Sentences.

Many conditional sentences are dependent either upon an infinitive (especially of indirect discourse) or upon a subordinate clause.

a) Dependent upon an infinitive: Asin. 97, promitto tibi non obfuturum, si effeceris; Aul. 344, te scio posse, si nil obviamst; 593; Bacch. 1195; Capt. 575, et me confido, si reconciliasso; Epid. 7, spondeo . . . me accepturum, si dabis; Men. 423, neque si venerit, eum volo intromitti; Merc. 797, eloquar me istanc protracturum esse in viam, nisi hinc abducit; M. G. 326; 453, nisi das fidem te huc, si omisero, ituram; 915; Trin. 53, credo te gaudere, si quid mihi mali est; And. 611, incolumem scio fore me, si devito hoc malum; H. T. 591; 881; Ad. 382, an laudi putat fore, si perdiderit? Cato, Agr. 39, 2, cogitato, si nihil fiet, nihilo minus sumptum futurum; And. 372, quasi necessus sit, si huic non dat, te illam ducere; Cato, Agr. 122, vinum concinnare, si transibit.

b) Dependent upon a subjunctive clause: Amph. 635, est placitum, plus mali adsit, boni si optigit quid; Capt. 747, quaeso, si rebitet, ut facias; 920, dicam ut ornet, si volet; Curc. 33, nemo

prohibet quin, si argentum est, emas; Epid. 310, metuo, si resciverit,
ne ulmos parasitos faciat; Men. 880, omnes quaeso, si revenerit, ni
indicetis; Merc. 586; Poen. 395; Pseud. 1019; Rud. 1257; 1294;
Trin. 1012; 1042, metuo ne, si compellabo, aliam rem occipiat loqui;
1168; Truc. 780, edico ne habeatis, nisi si voltis; Eun. 501, fac cures,
si forte advenerit, ut ores; Phor. 825; Hec. 387.

c) One protasis is frequently qualified by a second: XII Tab. 8,
si membrum rupsit, ni cum eo pacit, talio esto; ibid. si nox furtum
faxsit, si im occisit, iure caesus esto; Asin. 405, siquidem minis
animisque expletus cedit, si med iratus tetigerit, iratus vapulabit;
Aul. 442, si accesseris, nisi iussero, ego faciam; Bacch. 1001, si das,
ille alium gerulum quaerat, si sapiet; Epid. 543, quid si adeam, si
haec east; Merc. 819, si vir scortum duxit, id si rescivit uxor, in-
punest viro; M. G. 306, ⟨interii⟩ si taceo tamen, si hoc palam fuerit;
341, si ea domist, si facio, dignun es? 1251, si amavit aut si sapien-
tiam habet, per amorem si quid fecero, ignoscet; Pers. 294; Pseud.
723; Rud. 329, eadem, si scit, si videro, exquisivero; 727, si autem
Veneri complacuerunt, habeat, si argentum dabit; 789, si te offen-
dero, numquam quisquam me lenonem dixerit, si te non ludos
dimissero; 810, si attigerit, ni invitassitis, periistis; Trin. 95, si
scis me fecisse, si id non accusas, tute obiurigandus es.

d) Dependent upon a purpose clause: Epid. 279, ut amoveas, nisi
tuast secus sententia; Men. 428; M. G. 248, ne titubet, si exquiret;
Poen. 26; Rud. 700; And. 159, si quid consili habet, ut consumat;
316; Titin. 58, sin forma odio sum, tandem ut moribus placeam viro;
Cato, Agr. 12.

e) Dependent upon an indirect question: Pseud. 109, scis, mea si
commovi sacra, quo pacto soleam; Eun. 438, scin, si quando illa
mentionem facit, te ut urat; Hec. 567; Turp. 129.

f) Dependent upon a temporal clause: Pseud. 1146, quom libella
nusquamst, nisi leno hic subvenit tibi; 1261, ubi mammicula op-
primitur aut, si lubet, corpora conduplicant; Enn. Ann. 262.

Substantive *Si*-Clauses.

Substantive *si*-clauses occur especially with *miror* and *mirum*, and
as appositives of pronouns: Amph. 29, mirari non est aequom, sibi
si praetimet; M. G. 1326, nil miror si lubenter hic eras; Bacch. 409;

Capt. 545; Curc. 265; Merc. 784; Pers. 619; Pseud. 442; H. T. 525,
minime miror, hanc si deperit; 383; Cato, fr. Jord. 25, 5, idne iras-
cimini si quis superbior est quam vos? M. G. 1041, hau mirum si
te habes carum; Amph. 590, istaec miseriast si vi verum vincitur;
Asin. 830, numquidnam tibi molestumst si haec accubat? M. G.
947, volup est si procedit; H. T. 1054, ea lege hoc adeo faciam, si
facit; Eun. 382; Phor. 1040, adeone indignum tibi videtur, si habet
unam amicam? Ad. 255, id demum iuvat, si is bene facit; 357.

" Concessive " *Si*-Clauses.[1]

Many *si*-clauses in Plautus, and a few in Terence and other Early
Latin writers, are " concessive," i.e. adversative, in character. It is
not always easy to determine with precision what clauses have the
adversative force. Nutting adds to Kriege's list, and I have felt
constrained to do the same, though not accepting all of Nutting's
examples. The following instances, will, I believe, be fairly com-
plete for the early period. In many cases the adversative character
is emphasized by the presence of an adversative particle (*at, tamen,
saltem*).

a) With *at, tamen,* or *saltem* in the apodosis (18): Bacch. 365, si
illi sunt virgae, at mihi tergum domist; 887, si tibist machaera, at
nobis vervinast; Capt. 224, si erus tu mihi's, tamen viso opus est;
683, si peribo, at erit; Cas. 298, si sic nihil impetrare potero, saltem
sortiar; Cist. 67, si non est, tamen dolet; Curc. 4, si media nox est sive
prima vespera . . . tamen est eundum; Men. 746, si me derides, at
pol illum non potes; Merc. 636, ubi habitaret invenires saltem, si
nomen nequis; Poen. 51, sin odiost, dicam tamen; Rud. 1361, si
Iovis fuit, meus est tamen; Truc. 615, si tu bellator clues, at ego
clueo; 832, qui inprobust si quasi bibit sive adeo caret temeto,
tamen inprobust; Eun. 639, si illud non licet, saltem hoc licebit;
865, si digna sum, at tu indignus; Ad. 950, si multumst, tamen
faciundumst; Lucil. 590, si maluerit, privabit tamen; Acc. 619, si
a me regnum Fortuna eripere quivit, at virtutem nec quiit.

b) Without particle in the apodosis (23): Amph. 908, si dixi, nilo
magis es; 929, si non iubes, ibo egomet; Capt. 529, neque Salus

---

[1] Kriege, De enuntiatis concessivis apud Plautum et Terentium, 1884 ; Nutting,
Studies in the *Si*-Clause, University of California Publications, Classical Philology,
Vol. I, No. 2, p. 35 ff.

servare, si volt, me potest; Epid. 599; Men. 670 ; 751, idem dicam
si avom vis adducere; 1060; M. G. 519 ; 631; Most. 42, non omnes
possunt olere unguenta exotica, si tu oles ; 229; 914; Poen. 374, si
ante quid mentitust, nunciam dehinc erit verax tibi; Rud. 1014, si
tu proreta es, ego gubernator ero ; 1075; 1353, si maxume mi illum
reddiderit vidulum, non ego debeo triobolum ; 1400, non istoc me
intervortes, si aliam praedam perdidi; Stich. 287; Trin. 465, si sic
non licebit, luscus dixero ; 507 ; 607 ; Phor. 295, verum si cognatast
maxume, non fuit necesse habere ; Eun. 638, si non tangendi copiast,
ne videndi quidem erit ?

It is worthy of note that the adversative force of the *si*-clause is
occasionally emphasized by the presence of *maxume.* Thus: Rud.
1353; Phor. 295.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.[1]

QUOM–CLAUSES.

Quom, ' when.'

A.   THE *QUOM*-CLAUSE IS DESCRIPTIVE.

Instances of the descriptive *quom*-clause are not frequent.   Exam-
ples are : Bacch. 417, iam aderit tempus quom se oderit; cf. Hec.
543, pol iam aderit, se quom oderit; Capt. 518, hic illest dies quom
nulla salus sperabilest; Truc. 380, tempestas fuit quom inter nos
sordebamus (*sorderemus* P); Ad. 384, videre videor diem illum
quom profugiet; Enn. Ann. 262, nunc est ille dies quom gloria
maxuma sese nobis ostentat; Capt. 303, memini quom haud audebat;
Poen. 924, nunc est quom me commoror; And. 152, prope adest
quom alieno more vivendumst mihi; Eun. 551, nunc est profecto
interfici quom perpeti me possum; Stat. 119, nunc enim vero est
quom meae morti remedium reperibit nemo.

B.   THE *QUOM*-CLAUSE IS ADVERBIAL.

1. **With the present indicative (100).**
a) Referring to a single action in present time (18).
1) With *nunc:* Asin. 144, nunc quom est melius me ignoras;

---

[1] Autenrieth, Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie, Supplementbd. vi, p. 273 ;
Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 71 ff.; Hoffmann, Modus im lateinischen Zeit-
satze ; Lubbert, Die Syntax von *Quom.*   The last two works are characterized by a
perverted method.

Aul. 629, nunc quom compares, peris; Capt. 1022, nunc in memo-
riam regredior quom recogito; Merc. 178; Most. 588; Stich. 146;
Trin. 504; Hec. 649, nunc non est (ambiguom) quom eam sequitur
alienus puer; Ad. 738; H. T. 448.

  2) Without *nunc:* Amph. 416, mihi non credo, quom illaec autu-
mare illum audio; M. G. 1324, non queo quom te video; Poen. 283,
quom ornatum aspicio, paenitet; Rud. 1279, non censet quom volo;
Truc. 566; Acc. 346, me miserum, quom recordor, quom reminiscor.

  b) Achronistic *quom*-clauses in expressions of general truths (60),
e.g. Bacch. 548, se quom frustrant, frustrari alios existumant; Capt.
73, talos quom iacit scortum invocat; 78; 80; 255; 463; Epid. 147,
mihi dolet quom vapulo; Men. 226, voluptas nullast navitis maior quam
quom terram conspiciunt; M. G. 646, tacere quom aliena est oratio;
Pseud. 747, quid quom tenetur? 804; Stich. 124, quae, quom res
secundae sunt, se poterit gnoscere; Trin. 523, terra quom proscin-
ditur, boves moriuntur; And. 309, quom valemus, recta consilia
aegrotis damus; Eun. 498, rideo, quom in mentem venit; Phor. 241;
Cato, Agr. 17, 1, quom semen maturum habet, tum tempestiva est;
54, 5, quom edunt, exspectant; Lucil. 371, quom tecum est, quidvis
satis est.

  c) Historical presents (19), e.g. Amph. 668, gravidam reliqui
quom abeo; Capt. 282, vivom, quom inde abimus, liquimus; 887;
Epid. 217, quom venio, atque illam video; Men. 1115, quot eras
annos gnatus quom te pater avehit? Merc. 616, addicta erat quom
venio; Stich. 511; Truc. 401, mater ancillas iubet, quom decumus
mensis adventat, aliam aliorsum ire; And. 362, quom advenio, soli-
tudo ante ostium; H. T. 650, quom exponendam do, de digito
anulum detraho; Eun. 342; 345; 792; Stat. 225, te, quom ad nos
venis, subfarcinatam vidi.

  d) Present with future force (3); Capt. 724, quom alii octonos
ecfodiunt, nisi confeceris, Sescentoplago nomen indetur tibi; M. G.
891; Ad. 946, ego dicam, quom confit.

 2. With the imperfect indicative (33).

  a) With *modo, olim, tum,* in the main clause (7): Amph. 199,
quom pugnabant maxume, tum fugiebam maxume; Asin. 205, longe
aliam ⟨linguam⟩ praebes nunc atque olim quom dabam atque olim
quom inliciebas me ad te; 207; 927, modo, quom dicta in me in-

gerebas, odium eram; Cist. 186; Trin. 1092, res quom animam agebat, tum esse offusam oportuit; And. 545, alium esse censes nunc me atque olim quom dabam?

b) Without particle in the main clause (26), e.g. Bacch. 421, erat haec disciplina quom tu adulescens eras? 469, quom peribat vidi; Capt. 247, ne me secus honestes quam quom servibas; Curc. 541, quom credebam, credidi te nihil esse redditurum; Epid. 432, quod factitavi in adulescentia, quom militabam; Men. 632; 1145; Merc. 753, quam te amare dixti quom opsonabas; Pseud. 500; Truc. 733; Eun. 308, scis te mihi saepe pollicitum esse, quom ad te congerebam; Plaut. Boeot. 6; Turp. 167; Cato, Agr. prooem. 2, quom laudabant, ita laudabant; Jord. 39, 7, quom Romam veniebant, prorsus devorte-bantur. This last example is the only instance of *quom* iterative with the imperfect indicative that I have noted in Early Latin.

3. With the future indicative (62).

a) Referring to a single act (30), e.g. Bacch. 518, tum quom nihilo pluris referet; Cas. 134, quom illa dicet, quom haec dicentur, tum tu in medio pariete vorsabere; Poen. 726, volo vos commeminisse mox quom usus veniet; Asin. 749, horrescet quom audiet; Bacch. 825, orabis me quom rescisces; Men. 996, praesto ero, quom ven-ietis; M. G. 859; Pseud. 163, haec quom revortar facite ut offen-dam; H. T. 801, videbitur magis veri simile, quom dabit; Eun. 52, quom nemo expetet, venies; Phor. 695; Ad. 665, quid illi creditis fore quom videbit? Acc. 153.

b) In expressions containing general truths (32), only in Cato, de Agr. viz. 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto; 5, 8, quom exportabis, purgato; 17, 1, quom glubebit, tum tempestiva est; 23, 1, quom pluet, quala parentur; 94, quom ver adpetet, terram exaggerato.

4. With the perfect indicative (50).

a) Present perfect (6): Capt. 142, tum denique nostra intellegi-mus bona, quom ea amisimus; 256, etiam quom cavisse ratus est, saepe captus est; Epid. 227, tributus quom imperatus est, negant; Most. 277, itidem olent quasi quom una multa iura confudit coquos; Pers. 436; Pseud. 401.

b) With the historical perfect (44).

1) With some temporal particle or phrase (*tum, tunc, ibi, inde, olim,* etc.) in the main clause (10), e.g. Bacch. 960, ibi occidi Troilum

quom censuit; Men. 447, numquam feci peius quam hodie quom
contionem me inmersi; Rud. 846, in ara tunc sedebant quom ad me
profectu's ire? And. 883, olim quom ita animum induxti tuom,
eodem die istuc verbum in te accidit; H. T. 54, inde adeo quom agrum
mercatus es; 262; Phor. 912; Hec. 411, ea me abstinuisse in
principio, quom datast; 537; Lucil. 175, quom id nil visus facere
est, tum retia nexit.

   2) Without temporal particle in the main clause (34), e.g.,
Amph. 91, histriones quom Iovem invocarunt, venit; Poen. 723,
vidistis quom accepit? 904, adoptavit hunc quom diem obiit suom;
1070; Trin. 194, posticulum hoc recepit quom aedes vendidit; 872;
Phor. 9, si intellegeret, quom stetit olim nova, actoris opera stetisse;
31; 815, perliberalis visast quom vidi; Hec. 1, quom datast nova, inter-
venit vitium; 572; Enn. Trag. 189, quom illuc ventumst, ire illuc
lubet; Pacuv. 65; 328.

5. With the pluperfect indicative.

   I have noted but four examples of this tense in Early Latin:
Bacch. 426, id quom (*quoi*, codd.) optigerat, hoc etiam accersebatur;
Cas. 461, quom ei advorsum veneram, facere atriensem voluerat sub
ianua; And. 517, quom intellexeras, quor non dixti? 838, egomet
vidi iurgantem ancillam. : : scio. : : vero voltu, quom neuter prae-
senserat.

6. With the future perfect indicative (32).

   a) Referring to a single action (22), e.g. Bacch. 359, quom sciverit,
quid fiet postea? Poen. 405, mox dabo, quom rediero; Amph. 197,
meditabor quo modo illi dicam quom illo advenero; 466; Bacch.
358, quid futurumst quom resciverit? Capt. 434; Merc. 649, quom
veneris, aufugies? 1003; Rud. 766, quid quom inveneris? H. T.
484, quod quomque inciderit in mentem, volet; 557; Eun. 1067,
quod quom dixero, facitote; Phor. 185; Hec. 300, quod quom ita
esse invenero, quid restat? 474; 694; Enn. Praet. 5, quom spolia
detraxeritis, quam inscriptionem dabitis? Lucil. 590, hoc quom
feceris, non derit; Afran. 228, ea, quom venero, confecta ut offen-
dam; Turp. 193.

   b) In expressions containing general truths (10), only in Cato,
de Agr. e.g. 22, 4, quom advexeris, temperato; 38, 4, quom sub-
dideris, oblinito; 96, quom detonderis, unguito; 98, 2.

In the following the future is combined with the future perfect, H. T. 726, quom dixero et constituero, quom is certe renuntiarit, Clitipho quom in spe pendebit animi, decipiam ac non veniam; Cato, Agr. 25, quom vinum coctum erit et quom legetur, facito; 98, 2, quom unxeris, quom uti voles, extergeto.

Quom extemplo.

a) With the present: Amph. 865, huc autem quom extemplo adventum adporto, ilico Amphitruo fio; Bacch. 303, tristes ilico quom extemplo vident, subducunt lembum; Merc. 295, senex quom extemplo est, iam nec sentit.

b) With the future: M. G. 933, hanc ad nos, quom extemplo a foro veniemus, mittitote.

c) With the perfect: Most. 101, aedes quom extemplo sunt paratae, laudant fabrum; Trin. 242, quom extemplo perculsust, ilico res foras labitur; 492, quom extemplo emisimus, aequo mendicus censetur censu.

d) With the future perfect: Capt. 786, quom extemplo advenero, loquentur; M. G. 1176, quom extemplo hoc erit factum, ibi tu ilico facito; Trin. 725, quom extemplo arcum sumpsero, — dormibo.

Quom primum.

Quom primum, ' as soon as,' occurs Eun. 509, me video ab ea labefactarier iam tum quom primum iussit; Hec. 33, quom primum coepi, fecere ut exirem. In a different sense: Cas. 17, haec quom primum acta est, vicit omnis; And. 1, quom primum animum ad scribendum adpulit, id sibi negoti credidit solum dari.

Quom puto, quom cogito, etc., in Elliptical Expressions.

In *quom puto* and many similar expressions the *quom*-clause depends not upon the main clause of the sentence, but upon something to be supplied in thought. Thus Amph. 441, quom illum contemplo et formam cognosco meam, nimis similist mei; i.e. ' when I look at him and consider my own figure, I find that he is like me.' So in the following: Amph. 447, quom cogito, idem sum qui semper fui; Bacch. 449, quom huius dicta intellego, mira sunt ni; 597, quom huius verba interpretor, mihi cautiost; Capt. 51, homunculi quanti sunt quom recogito! Cas. 555, quom puto, si quid eius esset, esset mecum

postulatio; 910, quom cogito, non habuit; Cist. 316, quom interpre-
tor, haec est quae; Curc. 375, quom recogito, sufferam; 583, verba
mihi dedit, quom cogito; Men. 254, quom inspicio marsuppium, via-
ticati aestive sumus; 1064, haud est dissimilis, quom formam noscito;
Merc. 742; M. G. 1375; Rud. 771, quom coniecturam facio, haec est
illa simia; Stich. 301; 448; Trin. 256, haec quom reputo, apage te;
404; Truc. 452; H. T. 387, quom considero, mirabilest.

Quom Inversum.

I have noted only the following instances of *quom inversum* : Aul.
520, hos absolutos censeas quom incedunt; Men. 1054, tu clamabas
quom accurro; Eun. 633, longe abieram quom sensi; Enn. Com. 3,
quom desubito me orat mulier; Catulus, Baehr. p. 276, constiteram
forte salutans, quom subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.

Quom Explicative.

I have noted about forty instances of *quom* explicative, the some-
what inexact traditional name for those *quom*-clauses which indicate
that one act or condition is identical with another.   Examples:

a) Present (27), e. g. Aul. 194, petit quom pollicetur; Capt. 615,
Aiacem, hunc quom vides, ipsum vides; Cist. 692, memet moror
quom hoc ago; Epid. 344, mihi cesso quom sto; 691; Men. 156, te
morare mihi quom obloquere; 298, pro sano loqueris, quom me
appellas nomine; Merc. 468; M. G. 1070; Poen. 589, bene facitis
quom operam datis; 760; Pseud. 931, occidis me quom rogitas;
Trin. 342, quom illi dico, praemonstro tibi; Truc. 273, nunc places,
quom mi inclementer dicis; And. 18, quom hunc accusant, Naevium
accusant; 421, facis ut te decet, quom impetro; Ad. 96, quom illi
dico, tibi dico.

b) Imperfect: Epid. 138, desipiebam, quom mittebam; Com.
Frag. p. 138, Ribb. quom simulabat, tum detulit.

c) Perfect (12), e.g. Bacch. 166, fecisti furtum in aetatem malum
quom istaec flagitia me celavisti; 677, errasti quom parum immersti
ampliter; 925, cluent fecisse facinus maxumum quom Pergamum
subegerunt; Capt. 297, fecit officium quom tibi est confessus; 452,
rem constabilivi quom illos emi; Cas. 841, bona multa mihi dedisti,
quom huius copiam mi dedisti; Men. 668; 701.

Substantive *Quom*-Clauses.

In a few instances the *quom*-clause has substantive force, viz.: Cas. 39, abhinc annos factum est xvi quom conspicatust puellam exponi; Most. 694, non forte visum fuit quom dedit; Poen. 1203, hoc maxumumst (sc. vitium), quom sibi placent; Hec. 308, saepe est quom eadem causast factus inimicissumus.

Quom, 'since' ('seitdem').

In the following passages *quom* has the force of 'since': Amph. 302, iam diust quom (codd. *quod*) victum non datis, 'it is a long time that you have refused me sustenance;' Aul. 4, iam multos annos est quom possideo; Merc. 533, biennium est, quom mecum rem coepit; 535, iam biennium est quom tecum rem habet; 541, haud diust quom dentes exciderunt; Most. 470, quia vii menses sunt quom in hasce aedes pedem nemo intro tetulit; Pers. 137, non vi menses huc est quom commigravit; Trin. 402, minus xv dies sunt quom xl minas accepisti; Cato fr. (Jord.), p. 15, 9, non longinqua memoria est quom in arbore ensem viderunt quem Orestes reliquisse dicitur.

Apparently related, though logically obscure, are the three following examples: Asin. 251, iam diust factum quom discesti atque abistii; 890, iam dudum factumst quom primum bibi; Trin. 1010, iam dudum factumst quom abiisti domo. Logically these seem substantive clauses, serving as the subject of *factum est*.

Quom, 'while.'

I have noted but a single instance of this usage, viz. Bacch. 1122, pastor dormit, quom eunt palitantes.

Quom interea, quom interim.

In the three following passages *quom interea* (*quom interim*) is used to introduce a circumstantial clause: Men. 446, plus xxx annis natus sum, quom interea loci numquam quicquam feci peius quam hodie; Pers. 172, te iam sector quintum annum quom interim nondum edidicisti; Hec. 421, dies xxx in navi fui quom interea semper mortem exspectabam.

Quom magis . . . (magis).

In the following passages *quom magis (magis quom)* is used with
the force of *quo magis*: M. G. 935, magis quom periclum facies, magis
nosces; Most. 702, quom magis cogito, . . . neminem sollicitat;
Pers. 564, quom magis contemplo, magis placet.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *UBI*.[1]

1. With the present indicative (79).

a) Referring to present time: Rud. 441, ut timeo, ubi intueor;
Ad. 444, ubi video, vivere etiam nunc lubet.

b) In expressions of general truths (41).

1) With correlative particle in main clause (12): Aul. 197,
ubi manum inicit, ibi onerat aliquam zamiam; Epid. 166 a, ubi puden-
dumst, ibi eos deserit pudor; Most. 105, ubi illo inmigrat nequam
homo, hic iam aedibus vitium additur; 379, miserum est opus igitur
demum fodere puteum ubi sitis faucis tenet; Pers. 304, ubi se ad-
iuvat, ibi me adiuvat; 614, tibi ibidem das, ubi tuom amicum ad-
iuvas; Pseud. 311, ilico vixit amator, ubi supplicat; Stich. 733, tecum
ubi est, mecum ibi est; And. 631, ubist tempus promissa iam perfici,
tum se aperiunt; 638, nil pudet hic ubi opus est; ibid. ubi nil opust,
ibi verentur; Cato, Agr. 45, 3, ubi trimae sunt, tum denique maturae
sunt.

2) Without correlative particle (29), e.g. Bacch. 251, cor meum
finditur, ubi fit quomque mentio; Capt. 234, ubi habent, pessumi
fiunt; 500, ubi vident, eunt obviam; Pers. 313, ubi qui tangit, do-
lores cooriuntur; Pseud. 819, ubi coquont, condimentis non con-
diunt; Stich. 732, mecum ubi est, tecum est; H. T. 154, quod fit, ubi
non vere vivitur; Eun. 600, ita ut fit ubi domini absunt; 630; Phor.
715, ut cautus est, ubi nil opust; Cato, Agr. 6, 1, ubi ager crassus est,
sic observari oportet; 114; 157, 7. — *Ubi quando:* Capt. 290, ubi
quando sacruficat, Samiis vasis utitur.

c) With the historical present (26).

1) With correlative particles: Cist. 160, is ubi scit, ilico aufugit;
And. 356, ubi non invenio, ibi ascendo; H. T. 276, ubi aperit, continuo
se coniecit intro.

[1] Schubert, Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 20 ff.

2) Without correlative particles (23), e.g. Amph. 1061, ubi parturit, deos invocat; Bacch. 289, ubi eximus, homines sequi; Cas. 922; Poen. 1284, ubi nec leno nec illae redeunt, abii; H. T. 128, ubi video, haec coepi; 303, quid ait, ubi me nominas? 304; Eun. 260, ubi videt, homo coepit; 414; Phor. 862, ubi ire occipio, puer ad me adcurrit; Acc. 602, ubi adveniunt, nitidantur; Enn. Ann. 45; Turp. 194.

d) Referring to the future (10): XII Tab. 1, rem ubi pacunt, orato; Bacch. 995, ubi lubet, recita; Epid. 39, tu ipse ubi lubet, finem face; Eun. 460, ubi vis, non moror; 464; 814; 1088; Phor. 907, ubi voltis, uxorem date; Cato, Agr. 158, 1, ubi incipit, addito.

2. With the imperfect indicative (5).

Examples: Bacch. 685, quid, ubi reddebas aurum, dixisti patri? M. G. 856, ubi bacchabatur aula, cassabant cadi; Trin. 503, ubi usus nil erat, dicebat; Eun. 405, requiescere ubi volebat, quasi . . . nostin? Plaut. Fr. 26, ubi is te monebat. Of the foregoing examples, M. G. 856; Fr. 26; and Eun. 405 exhibit iterative force.

3. With the future indicative (73).

a) Referring to a single act (31).

1) With correlative particles (13): Epid. 595, ubi voles pater esse, ibi esto; 423, ubi erit otium, revortere ad me extemplo; 154, ubi scibit, continuo orabit: Pers. 653, actutum, ubi sciet, aderit; 728, ubi videbis, tum facito; Poen. 298; Rud. 426; 930, iam ubi liber ero, igitur demum instruam agrum; Truc. 871; H. T. 972, ubi scies, tum istoc utitor; Eun. 440, ubi nominabit Phaedriam, tu Pamphilam continuo; Ad. 526, ubi non videbit, iam huc recurret.

2) Without correlative particles (18), e.g. Capt. 341, alium misero, ubi erunt indutiae; Men. 257, ubi nihil habebis, gemes; Pers. 468, ubi videbis, id erit adeundi tempus; Rud. 933 a, ubi nobilitas mea clara erit, oppidum communibo; Truc. 189; H. T. 754, ubi videbit, optabit rursum; Eun. 52, ubi non poteris, venies; Phor. 48.

b) In general expressions — chiefly in Cato — (42), e.g. Truc. 879, ubi metues malum, fugito ad me; And. 848, ubi voles, accerse; Cato, Agr. 18, 6, aram ubi facies, fundamenta facito; 48, 1, ubi seres, vortito; 53; 54, 3; 127, ubi florebit, conligito.

4. With the perfect indicative (85).

a) Present perfect (36).

1) With correlative participles (8): Aul. 525, ubi res solutast, ibi cedit miles; Capt. 77, ubi res prolatae sunt, simul prolatae res sunt nostris dentibus; Most. 131, ubi emeritum est stipendium, tum specimen cernitur; 276, ubi sese sudor consociavit, ilico olent; Poen. 106, ubi est ingressus, ilico omnes meretrices invenit; Phor. 1010, ubi ad uxores ventumst, tum fiunt senes; Cato, Agr. 3, 1, ubi aetas accessit, tum aedificare oportet.

2) Without correlative particle (28), e.g. Asin. 304, ubi manus manicae complexae sunt, nec dependes nec propendes; Aul. 198, ubi tetigerunt, tenent; Bacch. 471; Curc. 60; 293; Rud. 984, ubi demisi retem, extraho; Truc. 301; H. T. 220, ubi adbibit plus paulo, sua quae narrat facinora! 390; 392; Hec. 242, ubi duxere, easdem exigunt; Cato, Agr. 2, 1, ubi venit, ubi salutavit, circum eat; 2, 2, ubi cognovit, vocet; ibid. ubi dixit, revoca; 157, 7.

It will be noted that none of these perfects are true present perfects, i.e. they do not denote an action completed in present time. They are either achronistic, or, where the main clause refers to the future, serve as future perfects, as in Cato, Agr. 2, 1; 2, 2.

  b) Historical perfect (49).

1) With correlative particles (15), e.g. Amph. 216, haec ubi legati pertulere, castris ilico producit exercitum; 242, hoc ubi conspicatus est, ilico equites iubet inducere; Bacch. 960, ubi tabellas ad senem detuli, ibi occidi Troilum; Capt. 559, credidi esse insanum extemplo, ubi te appellavit; Cas. 881, ubi deduxi, recta via abduxi; Cist. 137; 577, ubi elocutast, ego continuo interrogo; Curc. 363; H. T. 279, hic sciri potuit, ubi de improvisost interventum mulieri; 616, dixi, ubi mi ostendisti, ilico: 891; Eun. 1015, quid illi credis tum animi fuisse, ubi vidit? Stat. 160, ubi domum adveni, adsedi, extemplo savium dat.

2) Without correlative particles (34), e.g. Aul. 15, ubi is mortem obiit, coepi observare; 708, ubi ille abiit, ego me duco de arbore; Bacch. 265, quid, ubi ostendit symbolum? M. G. 123, ubi aspexit me, mihi signum dedit; Trin. 853, ubi conduxit, abduxit domum; Truc. 506, ubi natust, machaeram poscebat; And. 173, ita sensi, ubi audivit; H. T. 199; 121, ubi comperi, domum revortor; Eun. 165, nonne ubi dixti quaesivi? Phor. 866; Hec. 20, ubi sunt cognitae, placitae sunt; Enn. Trag. 72; Lucil. 626.

5. With the pluperfect indicative (3).

Examples: Asin. 209, ubi quid dederam, quasi columbae pulli in ore meo eratis; Phor. 572, quid tam diu commorabare, ubi id audieras? Hec. 130, ubi quomque datum erat spatium solitudinis, "Parmeno," (inquit). The first and third of these examples have iterative force.

6. With the future perfect indicative (130).

a) Referring to a single act (60).

1) With correlative particle (12), e.g. Bacch. 708, hoc ubi egero, tum istuc agam; Cas. 547, ubi nuptiae fuerint, tum convenibo; Men. 142, iam sciam, ubi videro; M. G. 1176, ubi abierit, ibi tu ilico facito; Pers. 162, ubi ego accepero, continuo tu adserito; Poen. 188, ubi expolivero, magis tum demum dices; Rud. 818, ubi advenerit, itote extemplo; Stich. 594, ubi convivae abierint, tum venias; Hec. 813; Ad. 203, ubi dixero, testis faciet ilico; 232, si . . . tum agam, ubi rediero.

2) Without correlative particle (48), e.g. Aul. 623, ego mihi bibam, ubi id fecero; Bacch. 757, ubi erit accubitum, ne quoquam assurgatis; 765; M. G. 946, ne quid, ubi miles venerit, titubet; 1169; Pseud. 750, ubi te aspexerit, narrabit; And. 837, ubi causa erit adempta, desinent; Eun. 55, eludet, ubi senserit; 596, ubi nos laverimus, lavato; Phor. 47, ferietur alio munere, ubi era pepererit; 143; 718; 892; Hec. 155, illam spero, ubi cognoverit, abituram denique; 791; Ad. 226; 378; Trabea, 3.

b) In general expressions (70), only in Cato, de Agr.

1) With correlative particles (3): Cato, Agr. 38, 3, ubi foderis tum facito; 83, ubi res divina facta erit, statim consumito; 112, 2, ubi pluerit, tum delegito.

2) Without correlative particles (67), e.g. Cato, Agr. 17, 1, ubi solstitium fuerit, tempestiva est; 21, 2, ubi feceris, circumplectito; 26, ubi erit lectum, oblinito; 38, 4, ubi combusseris, serito; 50, 2; 57, ubi facta erit, bibant.

7. With combinations of two tenses: Poen. 853, tibi reddam operam, ubi voles, ubi iusseris; Pseud. 1259, ubi amans complexust amantem, ubi labella adiungit, etc.; Cato, Agr. 45, 3, ubi trimae sunt, tum denique maturae sunt, ubi liber vortet.

Ubi primum.

I have noted the eight following examples of *ubi primum*: Amph. 203, ubi primum terram tetigimus, continuo Amphitruo delegit viros principes; Cist. 137; Men. 599, ubi primum est licitum, ilico properavi; M. G. 109, ubi primum evenit occasio, sublinit os; Poen. 1419, quando ire cogitas? : : ubi primum potero, ilico; Plaut. Frag. 30, ubi primum accensus clamarat meridiem; Eun. 628, ubi primum poterit, se subducet; Cato, Agr. 17, 2, ubi primum incipiunt, tum legi oportet.

Extemplo ubi.

Extemplo ubi occurs: Bacch. 977, vendam extemplo ubi oppidum expugnavero; Capt. 559; Curc. 80, extemplo ubi vino has conspersi fores, adesse me scit; cf. Stat. 160.

Ubi with Conditional Force.

In a few instances *ubi* seems to have nearly or quite the force of *si*, viz. Cas. 825, malo maxumo suo, ubi tantillum peccassit; Most. 255, ubi tu commoda es, capillum commodum esse credito; H. T. 208, ubi se cupiditate devinxit, necessest consilia consequi consimilia; Acc. 418, qui potis est refelli quisquam, ubi nullust causandi locus? Afran. 33, parentum est vita vilis liberis, ubi malunt metui quam vereri se ab suis; M. G. 915, hoc cogitato, ubi probus est architectus, facile esse navem facere; Capt. 955.

Substantive Clauses introduced by *Ubi.*

In the two following passages the *ubi*-clause has substantive force: Aul. 184, non temerariumst ubi dives blande appellat pauperem; Cato, Agr. 38, 4, hoc signi erit, ubi calx cocta erit.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUANDO.*[1]

1. With the present indicative (25).

a) Referring to present time, M. G. 1328, quom ego, quando aspicio, lacrumo; Truc. 817, nunc non tacebo quando adest.

b) Achronistic in general expressions (17): Amph. 123, vorsipellem se facit quando lubet; 862, Mercurius fit quando commodumst; 864,

---

[1] Scherer, De quando particula, Studemund's Studien, ii, p. 130 ff.; Schubert, Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 16 ff.; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, p. 76.

fio Iupiter quando lubet; Asin. 289, pro monstro est quando qui sudat tremit. Here the *quando*-clause is almost conditional in force and has substantive value. Asin. 301, centum pondo es quando pendes; 323, quando usus est, qui malum fert fortiter; Capt. 336, quam imber est quando pluit; Men. 78, quia mensam quando edo detergeo; 302, qui cyathisso quando potas; 926, quando essurio, tum crepant; Stich. 201, quando quem auctionem facturum sciunt, adeunt, perquirunt; 217, ridiculus aeque nullust, quando essurit; Trin. 671, quando eius copiast, tum non velis; Truc. 241, quando sterilis est amator, soli credimus; Titin. 128, quando fervit, confutat; Naev. Com. 26, ille ipse astat, quando edit. In Cas. 206, sine amet, quando tibi domi nil delicuom est, *quando* seems to be used in the sense of *quam diu.*

c) Referring to the future (6): Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt; Cas. 829, age, quando vis, uxorem accipe; Men. 215, quando vis, veni; 422, quando vis, eamus; M. G. 363, age, quando lubet; Pseud. 546, indice ludos, quando lubet.

2. With the imperfect indicative: only Pseud. 1180, in vigiliam quando ibat miles, conveniebatne in vaginam tuam machaera militis?

3. With the future indicative (19).

Examples: Capt. 231, scire memento, quando ... habebis; 406, quando sciet, numquam erit tam avarus quin; Men. 73; 270; 430, auferto tecum, quando abibis; 547; 984, prope est quando pretium exsolvet. This last is a descriptive clause. Men. 1034, quando ibis, una tecum ibo; M. G. 772, quando habebo, rationem dabo; 810; Most. 98, quando audietis, haud aliter dicetis; 403, neu quisquam responset, quando pultabit senex; Pseud. 257; ibid. ducito quando habebis; 646, quando eum censebo domi, rediero; Stich. 475; Trin. 788, epistulas quando adferet, nonne arbitraris? Liv. And. 12, quando dies adveniet; Enn. Ann. 281, nox quando volabit.

4. With the perfect indicative (19).

a) Present perfect (18): Asin. 216, quando auceps concinnavit aream, offundit cibum; 303, ad pedes quando adligatumst centumpondium, nec dependes nec propendes; Aul. 249, quando occasio periit, post sero cupis; 753; Capt. 86, quando res redierunt, (sumus) Molossici; Merc. 169; M. G. 753; Most. 87, disputavi hominem quoius rei, quando natus est, similem esse arbitrarer; 91; Pers. 637, omne ego pro nihilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit; 638, tamquam homi-

nem, quando animam ecflavit; Pseud. 831, cocilendrum quando
indidi, se patinae fervefaciunt; Truc. 36, quando abiit rete pessum,
adducit lineam; 101; 750; Pacuv. 38, canis quando est percussa
lapide, non appetit.   In the two following, *quando* has the force of
'now that': Stich, 723 a, quando bibisti, refer ad labeas tibias; Trin.
616, ut agro evortat, quando evortit aedibus.

b) Historical perfect: Poen. 458, quando noluit, pausam feci.

5. **With the pluperfect indicative:** Epid. 434, eradicabam hominum
auris, quando occeperam (an iterative use).

6. **With the future perfect indicative (13).**

Examples: Amph. 1097, absolvito me quando satis deluseris; Aul.
77, quam ut faciam, quando obstrinxero; Capt. 691, quando te excru-
ciaro, vel te interiisse praedicent; Cas. 109; 120; Curc. 364, laudato,
quando illud quod cupis effecero; Men. 664, opera reddetur quando
quid tibi erit surruptum; M. G. 524, quando exierit, cito transcurrito;
Most. 689, tum accedam, quando invenero; Pers. 730; Rud. 755;
Stich. 382; Truc. 417, quid me futurumst quando venerit?

Quandoque.

A single instance of *quandoque* occurs in Cato fr. (Jord.), 77, 4,
quandoque ista gens suas litteras dabit, omnia conrumpet.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUONIAM.*[1]

1. **Present tense (16).**   Most of the examples are of the historical
present, viz.: Aul. 9, quoniam moritur, numquam indicare id filio
voluit suo; Bacch. 290, quoniam sentio, navem extemplo statuimus;
292, quoniam vident, occeperunt navem tardare; 299, quoniam vi-
demus, capimus consilium; Men. 481, quoniam sentio errare, coepi
adsentari; Poen. 68, quoniam videt, conicitur in morbum; 665, au-
fugit, quoniam capitur oppidum; Rud. 67, quoniam video virginem
asportarier, tetuli ei auxilium; Stich. 411, quoniam videt, in amici-
tiam convortimus; Trin. 112, quoniam iturust, mihi commendavit;
149, quoniam hinc est profecturus peregre Charmides, thensaurum
demonstravit; Pacuv. 392, quoniam ille interit, imperium Cefalo
transmissum est; Cas. 583; Trin. 14; Truc. 402.

In the following passage the *quoniam*-clause refers to the future:
Rud. 1050, quoniam adsum, faciet nemo iniuriam.

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, p. 22.

2. With the perfect tense (7): Asin. 350, quoniam ille elocutus haec —— ; Bacch. 673, quid, quoniam occasio ad eam rem fuit? Capt. 30, quoniam indaudivit, nihil pretio parsit; M. G. 129, quoniam inspexi mulieris sententiam, cepi tabellas; Most. 1050, quoniam convocavi, atque segregant; Stich. 676, quoniam nuntiatum est, festinamus; Acc. Praetextae, 17, quoniam corpus dedi, visum est. Here *quoniam* has the force of *postquam*.

All of the foregoing examples are of the historical perfect.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *UT*. [1]

Ut temporal has different meanings as follows: (1) 'when'; (2) 'since' ('seitdem'); (3) 'after,' = *postquam*.

A. *Ut,* 'when.'

1. With the present indicative: Men. 522, satin ut quemque conspicor, ita me ludificant? Merc. 100, ut imus, ecce ad me advenit.

2. With the imperfect indicative (5): Asin. 343, in tonstrina ut sedebam, infit; Men. 63, rus ut ibat, rapidus raptori subduxit pedes; Merc. 216, quidque ut dicebam, mihi credebat; Ad. 406, ut numerabatur argentum, intervenit homo; Vid. 92, ut piscabar, ici vidulum.

3. With the perfect indicative (25).

a) Present perfect: M. G. 1264, omnes te amant ut quaeque aspexit; Most. 220, eundem animum oportet nunc mihi esse gratum, ut impetravi. In the second of these *ut* has the force of 'now that.'

b) Historical perfect (23): Amph. 203, ut illo advenimus, continuo delegit viros principes; 602, ut me praemisisti, ante aedis stabam; Aul. 705, ut dudum hinc abii, adveni; Bacch. 278, ut adsedi in stega, atque conspicor; 374; 388; Capt. 478, ut dudum abii, accessi; Epid. 14; Men. 1112; Merc. 187; Poen. 650, ut processimus, atque videmus; Rud. 914; And. 590, ut hinc te intro ire iussi, hic fit mi obviam; Phor. 617; Hec. 251, ut veni, incertum amisti; 345; 365; Liv. And. Trag. 2, ut Pergama accensa et praeda partita est; Naev. Trag. 41 ; Enn. Ann. 28, ut attulit lumen, memorat. — With *ut semel (semel ut)*: Turp. 161, te semel ut nacta est, semper studuit perdere; Volc. Sedig. p. 280 (Baehr.), navem ut semel conscendit, visus numquam est; Lucil. 702, ut semel vidi.

---

[1] Schubert, Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 10; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, p. 67 ff.

4. With the pluperfect indicative (11): Aisn. 408, Libanum ut iusseram venire, nullus venit; Bacch. 957, dudum primo ut dixeram mendacium, signum ex arce abstuli; Curc. 645, iam ut me conlocaverat, ventus exoritur; Men. 63, (rus ut ibat), ut pluerat; Most. 484, ut foris cenaverat tuos gnatus, abimus omnes; Poen. 486, ut quisque acciderat, eum necabam; Hec. 378, ut exieram (codd *exirem*), ad genua accidit; 802, ut quisque venerat, accedebam; Ad. 618, ut hinc forte ad obstetricem erat missa, accedo; Acc. 263, ut cuique obviam fuerat; Turp. 185, forte eo die meretricis ad me delenificae ut Atticae convenerant condixerantque cenam apud me.

5. With the future perfect indicative: only Truc. 330, ut properet suade, iam ut satis laverit.

B. *Ut,* 'since.'

A few instances of *ut,* 'since,' occur, viz.: Amph. 733, neque pedem intuli in aedis ut profectus sum eosque ut vicimus; Men. 635, ut dudum divorti, redeo nunc demum primum; Merc. 388, huc ut sum advectus, animus mihi dolet; Most. 470, pedem nemo intro intulit, semel ut emigravimus; Stich. 29, ut abierunt, hic tertius annus est; Hec. 751, pollicerer segregatum habuisse, uxorem ut duxit, a me Pamphilum.— *Ut primum:* Epid. 600, ut primum vidi, numquam vidi postea.

C. *Ut,* 'after.'

This usage seems to occur in Volc. Sedig. p. 280 (Baehr), ut Afer populo sex dedit comoedias, iter hinc in Asiam fecit.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *DUM.*[1]

In temporal clauses *dum* has the meanings: 'while,' 'as long as,' 'till.' Besides this we have several instances of *dum* circumstantial.

A. *Dum,* 'while.'

English 'while' has two meanings. It may indicate that one act is co-extensive in time with another, as 'While there is life, there is hope;' i.e. 'As long as there is life.' Or 'while' may indicate that one act occurs *in the course* of another, as, 'While these things were happening, an hour passed by.' It is *dum* in the latter of these two

---

[1] Elste, De *dum* particulae usu Plautino, 1882; Richardson, De *dum* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1886; Schmalz, Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, xi, p. 338 ff.; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 77 ff.

senses that is considered under the present category. The force of
the particle is often further indicated by *interim, interea*.

1. With the present indicative (105).

a) Referring to present time (i.e. to the time of the speaker's
present (28); e.g. Amph. 113, nox est facta longior, dum voluptatem
capit; Men. 878, quid cesso, dum licet? Merc. 778, dari potest
interea dum illi ponunt; M. G. 1317; Most. 20, dum lubet, pota;
Pers. 811, deInde erus dum abest; Poen. 41, dum ludi fiunt inrup-
tiones facite; 42; 491, dum referuntur, volo narrare; 914, nisi, dum
calet, hoc agitur; Pseud. 921; Stich. 764, da mihi savium, dum illic
bibit; Truc. 630, cesso me hinc amoliri, dum licet; 887, quem amo,
— dum inde aufero; And. 556, oro ut ante eamus, dum tempus datur;
597, potes nunc dum animus inritatus est; H. T. 345, fruare dum
licet; Eun. 56, dum est tempus, cogita; Phor. 549; Hec. 746, quaere
dum tempus est; Lucil. 595, salve dum licet.

b) The *dum*-clause is achronistic (6): Bacch. 816, quem di dili-
gunt adulescens moritur, dum valet, sentit, sapit; Curc. 170, ipsus se
excruciat qui homo quod amat videt nec potitur dum licet; Pers.
113, dum mane est, esse decet; 363, dum tunicas ponit, quanta adfi-
citur miseria; And. 266, dum in dubiost animus, paulo momento
impellitur; Phor. 341, dum tibi fit quod placeat, ille ringitur.

c) The *dum*-clause is equivalent to a present perfect, the main
clause being either a present perfect or a present with the force of a
present perfect (13):

1) With present perfect in main clause: Curc. 409, istoc
nomine, dum scribo, explevi ceras quattuor; Epid. 650, ego frater
factus (sum), dum intro eo et exeo? 670, ita dum te sequor, inva-
serunt in genua flemina; M. G. 1271, dum te optuetur, interim linguam
oculi praeciderunt; Pers. 448, dum stas, reditum opportuit; Poen.
362, dum exspecto, neque aliam paravi copiam neque, etc.; Trin. 30,
dum illi aegrotant, mores mali succrevere; H. T. 242; 257, dum
patria careo, tu conlocupletavisti te; Eun. 949, perdidisti istum
adulescentulum, dum studes dare verba nobis; Ad. 691, dum dubitas
menses abierunt.

2) With present (= present perfect) in main clause: H. T.
240, dum moliuntur, annus est; Stat. 147, dum eius mortem inhio,
inter vivos vivo mortuos.

d) The *dum*-clause is an historical present (45), e.g. Amph. 1120, dum haec aguntur, exclamat; Bacch. 279, dum circumspecto, atque conspicor; Cas. 241; 909, dum quaero, arripio capulum; Merc. 193, dum haec aguntur, advehitur pater; Trin. 166, ruri dum sum, inscribit; Eun. 255, dum haec loquimur, concurrunt laeti omnes; 328; 583; 592, dum haec mecum reputo, accersitur virgo; Phor. 91, dum sedemus, intervenit adulescens; Enn. Ann. 182, dum censent terrere minis, hortantur ibei sos; Amph. 1098, dum haec aguntur, audivimus; Bacch. 950, paene interiit, dum exquirit; Cas. 976; Cist. 90, dum redeo, consecutast; Curc. 682, decem minas dum solvit, omnis mensas transiit; Men. 449, dum hieto, se supterduxit; Merc. 97, dum in portu ambulo, hospes me adgnovit; Stich. 366, dum percontor, conspicatus sum; H. T. 272, dum narrat, audivi; 491, somnum oculis non vidi, dum quaero; 983, id egi, dum loquitur; Eun. 341, dum haec dicit, abiit hora; 629; Ad. 541, dum quaero, mercennarium vidi; Merc. 924, quia scortum adduxerit, dum ruri ipsa abest; Most. 1017, mecum ut ille hic gesserit, dum tu abes, negoti; Hec. 803, dum sedeo, ut quisque venerat, accedebam ; 829, dicit se anulum, dum luctat, detraxisse; Enn. Ann. 248, dum transit striderat hasta.

e) The *dum*-clause refers to the future (13): Asin. 914, ut decumbamus suadebo, hi dum litigant; Amph. 980, volo deludi illum dum mihi morigero; Aul. 621, perscrutabor fanum, dum hic occupatus est; Cas. 798; Curc. 466, dum hic egreditur, commostrabo; Men. 330; Merc. 553; 1005, non utibilest hic locus, dum memoramus, arbitri ut sint; M. G. 595, ne, dum apsum, fuant; Most. 216, si inservibis, dum tibist haec aetatula; Eun. 595, sic facito, dum lavamus; Hec. 725, vin adesse me una dum istam convenis? Ad. 312, ut hanc iram in eos evomam, dum aegritudo haec est recens.

2. With the imperfect indicative: only Eun. 728, dum accubabam,[1] quam videbar mihi pulchre esse sobrius !

3. With the future indicative (4): Amph. 95, animum advortite, dum argumentum eloquar; Men. 214, dum coquetur, interim potabimus; Truc. 737, quid erit magistrae, dum tu commentabere ? Cato, Agr. 144, 5.

4. With the perfect indicative (6): Amph. 599, omne, uti quicque

---

[1] Schmalz, Arch. f. lat. Lex. xi, 338, takes this as illustrating the use of *dum*, 'as long as.' This may be right.

actumst, dum apud hostis sedimus, edissertavit; Capt. 925, quae,
dum hic fui, sustentabam; M. G. 504, quod confregisti imbricis, dum
sectatu's simiam; Stich. 628, dum parasitus fuisti, rem confregimus;
Truc. 380, tempestas quondam, dum vixi, fuit; Turp. 172, dum ego
conixi somno, hic sibi prospexit vigilans virginem.

B. *Dum*, 'as long as.'[1]

1. With the present indicative (14).

a) The *dum*-clause is achronistic (9): Capt. 83, victitant suo
suco dum ruri rurant homines quos ligurriant; 233, dum impetrant,
boni sunt; Men. 193, meretrix tantisper blanditur, dum videt; Trin.
309, dum vivit, victor cluet; Truc. 164, dum vivit, hominem noveris;
322, dum vivont, lavant; Eun. 934, dum foris sunt, nil videtur
mundius; Ad. 70, dum credit, tantisper pavet; Acc. 344, oblectat
spes, dum censet.

b) The *dum*-clause refers to the future (5): Men. 72, haec urbs
Epidamnus est dum haec agitur fabula; Truc. 11, Athenis hoc est
proscaenium tantisper dum transigimus hanc comoediam; Enn. Ann.
331, dum quidem unus homo Romanus superescit; 379, unus dum
quit surum ferre tamen, defendere possunt; Cato, (Jord.), p. 38, 11,
bene factum, dum vivitis, non abscedet.

2. With the imperfect indicative: Truc. 165, dum vivebas, noveram;
And. 53, qui scire posses, dum aetas metus magister prohibebant ?

3. With the future indicative (15): Asin. 463, credam fore, dum
quidem habebo; Bacch. 225, nec quoiquam supplico, dum hoc vale-
bit pectus; 443, noster esto, dum te poteris defensare; Men. 93,
facile adservabis, dum eo vinclo vincies; M. G. 50, dum tale facies,
adsiduo edes; Pseud. 337; 507; Rud. 557; H. T. 106, te meum dici
tantisper volo, dum facies; 136, usque dum ille vitam illam colet,
supplicium dabo; 714; Ad. 118, dabitur argentum dum erit commo-
dum; 157; Cato, Agr. 30, usque dum habebis, praebeto; 90; Frag.
(Jord.), 42, 1, quid opinamini animi habituros, dum vivent ? (Jord.
viverent).

4. With the perfect indicative (15): Epid. 178, Hercules fui, dum

---

[1] The *dum*-clauses brought under this head indicate that the time of the subordi-
nate clause is co-extensive with that of the main clause. This notion is often further
emphasized by the addition of *tantisper*, *usque*, or some other similar word. English
' while ' is sometimes used in translating these.

illa mecum fuit; Merc. 387, perpetuo recte (sc. valui) dum illic fui;
M. G. 1220, cum ipso sum locuta, dum lubitum est; Most. 133, usque
probus fui, in fabrorum potestate dum fui; Pseud. 256; dedi dum
fuit; so Truc. 217; 393, me habebat, dum hic fuit; And. 188, dum
tempus tulit, sivi; 443; 832; H. T. 987, dum fuisti solus, tibi
dabant; Hec. 459; 461; 594; 837.

C. *Dum,* 'until.'

It is often difficult to determine whether *dum* has the meaning
'until,' or 'as long as.' Thus in a sentence like Bacch. 737, which I
take as meaning, 'Wait till he writes,' others (e.g. Schmalz, Archiv,
xi, p. 338) interpret 'Wait while he is writing.' It is possible to
put a similar interpretation on a large number of the examples I
have brought under this head. The particles *usque* and *tantisper* are
frequently used to emphasize the force of *dum.*

1. With the present indicative, which, of course, has future force (43),
e.g. Asin. 327, mansero usque dum peris; Bacch. 737, mane dum
scribit; 988, ades dum has pellego; 1005, ausculta dum perlego;
Cas. 879, operam date, dum mea facta itero; Curc. 241, perdura dum
intestina exputescunt; 253; 280, date viam, dum officium facio;
Epid. 633, opperire dum ecfero argentum; Merc. 656, quanto satius
est ibi vivere adeo dum te amor missum facit; M. G. 232; 582, me
occultabo dum haec consilescunt turbae; 1333; 1404; Most. 99;
683; 687, huc concessero dum convoco; Rud. 774, (oro) ut illas ser-
ves, dum ego erum adduco; 938, mane dum hanc rudentem complico;
1036, remitte restem dum concedo et consulo; And. 329, profer dum
proficiscor aliquo; 714, dum exeo, parumper opperire; H. T. 717,
unus est dies dum argentum eripio; 833; Eun. 206, expectabo dum
venit; Phor. 512, ut me maneat dum id argentum aufero; 982, retine
dum servos evoco; Ad. 196, delibera dum redeo; Stat. 227, dum
abit, huc concessero.

2. With the future indicative (5): Amph. 470, illos dementiae con-
plebo adeo usque satietatem dum capiet; Cas. 485, id rus hoc erit
tantisper dum faciam nuptias; Phor. 583, tacebit dum intercedit
familiaritas; Cato, Agr. 22, 2, armillis ferreis temperato usque dum
recte temperabitur. The Casina passage is uncertain. Possibly it
illustrates *dum,* 'as long as.'

3. With the future perfect indicative (4): Pers. 52, usque ero domi dum excoxero lenoni malam rem; Cato, Agr. 56, panis pondo v usque adeo dum esse ficos coeperint; 110, facito usque dum odorem malum dempseris; 112, 3, decarpito usque dum impleveris.

Schmalz (Archiv, xi, p. 338) calls attention to the fact that *dum*, 'till,' with the perfect indicative is unknown in Early Latin.

Dum Circumstantial.

The *dum*-clause often denotes an attendant circumstance of the main action, viz. in the following passages: Cas. 566, contrivi diem dum adsto, i.e. 'I have wasted the day standing;' Merc. 346, nec quid consili capere possim . . . dum servi mei perplacet consilium, dum rusum hau placet. Some editors place a strong mark of punctuation after 347 and take *dum . . . dum* as = *nunc . . . nunc.* M. G. 762, procellunt sese in mensa, dum appetunt; Pseud. 685, certa mittimus, dum incerta petimus; Rud. 37, dum alios servat, se impedivit; Trin. 839, quibus aerumnis deluctavi, filio dum divitias quaero; 1149, quid ego ineptus, dum sermonem vereor interrumpere, solus sto? And. 822, dum studeo obsequi tibi, paene inlusi vitam filiae; H. T. 16, rumores distulerunt multas contaminasse Graecas, dum facit paucas Latinas; Eun. 745, dum tibi sororem studeo reddere, sum multa passus; Phor. 76, fidelis dum sum, scapulas perdidi; Hec. 800, totum desedi diem dum exspecto; Ad. 868, dum studeo ut quam plurimum facerem, contrivi vitam; Turp. 149, rem despoliasti, foede dum in lustris lates; Stat. 108, modo fit obsequens hilarus dum id quod petit potitur; M. G. Arg. Acr. 2.

Sometimes the circumstantial clause develops a decided causal force, viz. Men. 257, geminum dum quaeris, gemes, i.e. 'You will come to grief in consequence of your search'; M. G. 409, dum te fidelem facere ero voluisti, apsumptu's paene; Rud. 514, mendicitatem mi optulisti opera tua dum ausculto; Phor. 767, facimus ut malis expediat esse, dum nimium dici nos bonos studemus; Ad. 899, occidunt me dum nimis sanctas nuptias student facere.

In the following passage the *dum*-clause seems to have adversative force: Cas. 367, dum 'mihi' volui, 'huic' dixi, atque dum cupio —.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *DONEC, DONICUM,*
'UNTIL.'[1]

1. With the present indicative: only Cist. 582, ⟨non⟩ destiti instare usque adeo donec se adiurat anus mihi monstrare; Merc. 194, neque quisquam conspicatus est, donec subit; Most. 116, neque id faciunt donicum parietes ruont.

2. With the future indicative (4): Liv. And. 20, manens sedeto donicum videbis; Cato, Agr. 43, 2, usque donec trimae erunt, fodere oportet; 106, misceto usque donec ovum natabit; 156, 5, coquito usque donec conmadebit.

3. With the perfect indicative (5): Amph. 597, neque credebam donec Sosia me fecit ut crederem; Truc. 38, rete impedit piscis, usque adeo donicum eduxit foras; And. 660, numquam destitit instare usque adeo donec perpulit; Hec. 125, illud visumst ne utiquam grave, donec iam in ipsis nuptiis postquam videt . . . aegre tulit; Acc. 116, donec tu auxilium, Perseu, tetulisti mihi; Cato, (Jord.), p. 43, 4, qui apud regem fuisti donicum ille tibi interdixit rem capitalem.

4. With the future perfect indicative (21): Aul. 58, aut si respexis donicum te iussero; Bacch. 758, ne quoquam exsurgatis, donec erit signum datum; Capt. 339, ego me amitti, donicum ille redierit, non postulo; Pseud. 1167, hunc faciamus ludos, donicum senserit; Rud. 715, aetatemque ibi te usque habitare, donec totum carcerem contriveris; M. G. 269, ibo odorans donec persecutus volpem ero; Vid. fr. v, neutri reddibo, donicum res diiudicata erit haec; 91, usque donec solvero; Plaut. Frag. 155, inimicus esto donicum revenero; Phor. 419, haud desinam donec perfecero; 590; Ad. 717, domi certum obsidere est usque, donec redierit; Cato, Agr. 67, 2, amurcam commutet usque adeo donec in lacum pervenerit (bis); 76, 4; 86, lacte addat usque adeo donec cremor crassus erit factus; 88, 1; 88, 2; 146, 2 donicum solutum erit, pigneri sunto; 149, 2, donicum satisfecerit, pigneri sunto; 150, 2; 161, 3, usque licebit vellas, donicum in semen videris ire; CIL, i, 198, 65, ad eam diem donec solutum erit.

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 79 f.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *POSTQUAM*.[1]

Besides its usual meaning of ' after,' *postquam* also has the signifi-
cations: ' now that' and ' since.' Occasionally also *postquam* has
causal force.

A. *Postquam*, ' after.'

1. With the historical present (17), e.g. Capt. 24, postquam bellige-
rant Aetoli, capitur filius; 487, abeo, postquam video; Curc. 325,
tibi sunt parata postquam scimus venturum; 683, postquam nil fit,
clamore hominem posco; Men. 24, postquam septuennes sunt, pater
oneravit navem; Phor. 632, postquam sentio, inquam; Hec. 120;
126, postquam videt, ibi demum ita aegre tulit; Ad. 765, postquam
sum satur, prodeambulare huc lubitumst; Stat. 4, capit consilium,
postquam sentinat satis; Afran. 207, postquam videt, commendat;
Enn. Ann. 38, postquam consistit fluvius; Cato (Jord.), p. 34, 4,
postquam praeterimus, classem ventus fert.

2. With the imperfect indicative: Most. 647, postquam haec aedes
ita erant, continuo est alias mercatus; Phor. 569, postquam videt,
simul autem non manebat aetas virginis meam neclegentiam, aibant.

3. With the perfect indicative (89), e.g. Amph. 227, postquam id
actumst, tubae canunt; 802, quid, postquam lavi? Bacch. 170, quam
ego biennio postquam hinc abii, conspicio lubens; Capt. 19, is post-
quam hunc emit, dedit gnato; Cas. 47, postquam ea adolevit, eam hic
senex amat; 433, ut sussultabat, postquam vicit vilicus; Cist. 176,
postquam fecit, commigravit; Curc. 336, postquam mihi responsumst,
abeo; Men. 34, postquam puerum perdidit, animum despondit;
Merc. 198, postquam aspexit, rogitare occepit; 256, postquam trans-
egi, atque conspicor; Most. 485, postquam rediit, abimus omnes
cubitum; Poen. 104, postquam eas perdidit, usquequaque quaeritat;
Pseud. 1268, hoc modo hunc diem sumpsimus, postquam opus meum
perpetravi; Stich. 364, postquam me misisti, sese sol superabat;
Trin. 417, postquam comedit rem, post rationem putat; 975, post-
quam ego me aurum ferre dixi, post tu factu's Charmides; Truc.
647, post illuc quam veni, advenit qui debebat; And. 35, postquam
te emi, ut clemens fuerit servitus scis; H. T. 656, postquam aspexi,

---

[1] Schubert, Temporalkonjunktionen bei Plautus, 1881, p. 2; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis
Plautina, p. 67 ff.

ilico cognovi; Eun. 137, postquam sensit, fingit causas; Hec. 367, postquam me aspexere, ilico exclamant; 373, postquam intro adveni, extemplo eius morbum cognovi; Acc. 118; Stat. 164, placere occepit graviter postquam emortuast; Turp. 72, postquam venimus, veneratur deos; Afran. 8; Naev. Bell. Pun. 3, postquam aspexit, ponuntur.

  5. **With the pluperfect indicative (3)**: And. 177, postquam audierat non datum iri uxorem, numquam verbum fecit; Phor. 908, omnis posthabui res, postquam id vos velle animum advorteram; Stat. 44, si illi, postquam rem paternam amiserant, iactati forent.

  6. **With the future perfect**: only Cato, Agr. 65, post diem tertium quam lecta erit, facito; 161, 2, post annum tertium quam severis, incendito.

<div align="center">

B. *Postquam,* 'now that.'

</div>

  In English we seldom employ 'after' in connection with the present and present perfect tenses, but use 'now that' instead. Latin, however, uses *postquam* in such cases, often accompanied by *nunc* in the main clause.

  a) With the present (5): Bacch. 530, illam me velim convenire, postquam inanis sum; Truc. 344, si mi optigerit hereditas, nunc postquam scio dulce atque amarum quid sit ex pecunia; 919, iamne abis, postquam aurum habes? And. 513; Hec. 680, nunc postquam ademptam hanc tibi causam vides, nactus alteram es.

  b) With the perfect (17): Aul. 79, nunc defaecato animo egredior domo, postquam perspexi salva esse omnia; 454, temperi, postquam implevisti fissorum caput; Capt. 144, postquam potitust hostium, nunc desidero; Cas. 559, veniat velim, ut eum ludificem vicissim postquam hunc delusi; Pers. 528, postquam recitasti, iam mihi credis? 711, postquam abiit, licet; Pseud. 394, postquam abiit, astas solus; 991, scio iam me recte tibi dedisse, postquam elocutus nomen es; Stich. 108, uxorem quaero, postquam vostra mater mortuast; Trin. 600, ibo, postquam exturbavit hic nos; 998, postquam abiit, loquendi libere videtur tempus; Truc. 640, postquam peperit, animos sustulit; Vid. 62, cur patronum quaeram postquam litem perdidi? And. 304, postquam adempta spes est, cura confectus stupet; 740, revortor, postquam paravi; Ad. 1; Afran. 16, nunc resipivi, postquam pectus est laetitia onustum.

C. *Postquam*, 'since.'

Postquam, 'since,' occurs:

a) With the present indicative: Epid. 504, postquam liberast, ubi habitet incerte scio; Men. 234, hic annus sextus est, postquam ei rei operam damus; Most. 925; Truc. 682, postquam in urbem crebro commeo, dicax sum factus.

b) With the perfect indicative (15): Amph. 605, huic homini nescioquid est mali obiectum, postquam a me abiit; 846, ita nunc homines inmutantur, postquam peregre advenimus; Cist. 683, si nemo praeteriit, postquam abivi; Men. 400, neque postquam natus sum, intra portam penetravi pedem; 684, postquam illam dudum tibi dedi, nunc redeo; 1050, men convenisse te audes dicere, postquam imperavi? Merc. 12, biennium iam factumst postquam abii; Most. 957, postquam abiit, numquam desitum est potarier; Pers. 822, iam diu factum est, postquam bibimus; Pseud. 1052, nunc demum mi animus in tuto locost, postquam iste hinc abiit; Stich. 156, postquam natus sum, satur numquam fui; 267, numquam iussit postquam vir abiit; Truc. 773, postquam una cura cor meum movit, timeo ne; Hec. 394, postquam ad te venit, mensis agitur hic septumus; Enn. Ann. 389, DCC sunt anni postquam condita Roma est.

In M. G. 124, postquam occasio est, conqueritur fortunas; Pseud. 1220, perdidisti postquam dixisti ' pedes,' *postquam* has the force of *simul ac.*

D. *Postquam* causal.

In the following instances the *postquam*-clause **has a causal force:**
Eun. 84, tremo horreoque postquam aspexi hanc; Phor. 1, postquam poeta vetus poetam non potest retrahere a studio, maledictis deterrere parat. Scherer, De particula *quando,* p. 7, brings other examples under this head, *viz.:* Capt. 487; Curc. 683; Most. 647; Ad. 765; Hec. 187, 680. But it is obviously impossible to determine to what extent either the temporal or causal force predominates in such clauses. All we can say is, that in many cases a more or less pronounced causal force has developed in the *postquam*-clauses.

TEMPORAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *PRIUS QUAM* AND *ANTE QUAM.*[1]

1. *Prius quam* **with the present indicative (42).**

a) The *prius quam*-clause is achronistic (6).

   1) Referring to a single act (3): Men. 276, prius ambulant ante ostium quam ego redeo; Merc. 456, prius respondes quam rogo. : : prius emis quam vendo.

   2) Referring to general truths (3): Bacch. 440, prius quam septuennis est, paedagogo tabula disrumpit caput; Capt. 663, occant prius quam sariunt; M. G. 709, prius quam lucet, adsunt.

b) With the historical present: Curc. 637, prius quam moritur, mihi dedit; Poen. 66, puer septuennis surripitur sexennio prius quidem quam moritur pater; Eun. 10.

c) Referring to the future (34), e.g. Asin. 232, est etiam prius quam abis quod volo loqui; 448, adeam optumumst prius quam incipit; 940; Bacch. 382, prius quam malum istoc addis, certumst dicam patri; 932; Capt. 831, aperite, prius quam exitium adfero; Curc. 210, tene, prius quam abeo, savium; 566, reddin annon virginem, prius quam te huic meae machaerae obicio? Epid. 615; Men. 920; Merc. 1010, hanc volo prius rem agi quam refero pedem; M. G. 1329; 1005; 1339, te saluto prius quam eo; 1408; Most. 326, cave ne prius accumbas quam coimus; Pers. 140, numquam prius edes quam adfirmas; Poen. 789, quid dubito fugere prius quam trahor? 1211; 1398, ut minam reddas prius quam abducere; Stich. 538; Trin. 198; 983; Truc. 115; And. 311, omnia experiri certumst prius quam pereo; 556, ut ante eamus . . . prius quam scelera redducunt animum ad misericordiam; H. T. 237; Phor. 719; 897, conveniundust Phormio, prius quam dilapidat nostras xxx minas; 1037; Enn. Trag. 315, auxilium peto prius quam oppeto pestem; Pacuv. 207, prius quam intereo spatium danunt; Acc. 189, prius quam oculi vescuntur.

2. With the imperfect indicative: Bacch. 438, olim prius honorem capiebat suffragio quam desinebat esse dicto oboediens; Truc. 511, quid illi exitiost prius quam poterat ire in proelium?

---

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 80; Hullihen, *Antequam* and *Priusquam.* *Ante quam* is exceedingly rare in Early Latin. With the indicative it occurs only Cato, Agr. 161, 2 and Frag. (Jord.), p. 51, 3.

3. With the future indicative (7): Bacch. 100, prius hic adero quam te amare desinam; Pseud. 524, prius quam pugnabo, ego etiam prius dabo aliam pugnam; 885, prius quam dabis, gustato; Stich. 197, auscultabo prius quam conloquar; Cato, Agr. 72, prius quam ages, unguito; 134, 1, prius quam messim facies, porcam fieri oportet; ibid., praefato prius quam immolabis. In a similar passage to this last, and immediately preceding it, we have the subjunctive: *prius quam condas.*

4. With the perfect indicative (30).

a) Present perfect (6): Amph. 513, prius abis quam lectus ubi cubuisti concaluit locus; Merc. 156, prius quam sum elocutus, scis; Poen. 919; Pseud. 817; Trin. 526, vinum, prius quam coctumst, pendet putidum; Hec. 287, omne tempus prius quam id rescitumst lucrost. In the first of these passages the reference is to a single act. The others are general expressions.

b) Historical perfect (22): e.g. Amph. 102, prius quam abiit, gravidam uxorem fecit; Asin. 141, prius quam istam adii atque dedi, vitam oblectabas; Aul. 208, prius quam redii, exanimatus fui; Capt. 537, utinam te di prius perderent quam periisti; Cist. 616, prius hanc compressit quam uxorem duxit; Epid. 628, prius venisset quam tu advenisti; M. G. 119, prius perii quam ad erum veni; Pseud. 53; Trin. 976, prius non eras quam feci mentionem; Hec. 294, prius quam hanc uxorem duxi, habebam alibi animum; Pacuv. 167, prius data est quam dicta aut quam reditumst; Enn. Ann. 156; Lucil. 451; Cato (Jord.), p. 51, 3, ante quam is coepit.

c) The present perfect has the force of a future perfect: Aul. 397, cesso, prius quam perii, currere? Most. 78, facite ut redeat prius quam omnia periere.

5. With the pluperfect: only Amph. 603, prius multo ante aedis stabam quam illo adveneram.

6. With the future perfect (18), e.g. Bacch. 920, non dabo prius quam filium convenero; Epid. 70, patrem prius convenire se non volt quam id argentum dinumeraverit; 122, nisi prius comparassit xl minas quam fuero elocutus; 271; 304, ne abitas prius quam venero; Merc. 496; 862, non concedam prius profecto quam investigavero; M. G. 214; Pers. 219; Poen. 908; Pseud. 1030, metuo ne advenat prius quam hinc abierit; H. T. 584, hic prius se indicarit quam ego argen-

tum effecero; Phor. 1044; Cato, 161, 2, ne ante sarueris quam aspa-
ragus natus erit; Pacuv. 325, haud sinam quidquam profari prius
quam accepso.

Except in Poen. 908 and Hec. 584, the main clause is negative in
all the foregoing examples of the future perfect.

Simul ac, simul, simul ut.

The material under this head is as follows: Liv. And. 21, simul
ac lacrumas de ore detersit; Lucil. 757, continuo, simul ac paulo
vehementius aura inflarit, fluctus erexerit extuleritque; Asin. 478, id
fiet simul ac conspexero; Phor. 823, hic simul argentum repperit cura
sese expedivit; Cato, Agr. 48, 2, simul herbae inceperint nasci,
eximito; Liv. And. 28, simul advenit, portant ad navis edulia alma;
Afran. 5, simul limen intrabo, illi extrabunt ilico; Titin. 50, simul
ut crevi (from *cerno*); Enn. Ann. 74, et simul effugit, speres ita
funditus nostras; Acc. 448, timida eliminor, simul ac nota vox ad
auris accidit.   See Jones, Archiv für lat. Lexikog. xiv, p. 92.

CLAUSES OF COMPARISON IN THE INDICATIVE.

*Ut-*Clauses.[1]

Ut-clauses of comparison fall into the following classes:

**1. One act or state in its entirety is compared with another, the rela-
tion being usually emphasized by the employment of some correlative
particle, such as *item, ita, itidem,* etc., e.g.**

a) With correlative *ita:* Rud. 381, ut multi fecit, ita probe cura-
vit; Trin. 668, ita est amor ballista ut iacitur; And. 303, ut animus
in spe fuit, ita stupet; Ad. 681, ita velim me ames ut dolet; Cato,
Agr. 77, ita uti placenta fit, eadem omnia facito; 151, 3, serito
crebrum ita uti linum seri solet.

b) With correlative *item:* Bacch. 963, ut ille se blanditiis exemit,
item ego dolis me extuli a periculo; Pseud. 868, faciam te item ut
Medea Peliam concoxit; 1019, formido ne malus item erga me sit, ut
erga illum fuit; Stich. 462, ut illa vitam repperit, item me spero
facturum; Truc. 568, meretricem item esse reor, mare ut est; H. T.
417, item ut filium meum amico video inservire, nos quoque senes
est aequom senibus obsequi.

c) With correlative *itidem:* Ampli. 711, salutare me solebas, itidem

---

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 57 ff.

ut pudicae solent; Curc. 690; Merc. 826, si itidem plectantur, ut illae exiguntur; Rud. 659, iube oculos elidere, itidem ut sepiis faciunt coqui; Trin. 977, itidem ut charmidatus es, recharmida.

d) With correlative *proinde:* Capt. 314, uti tu me hic habueris, proinde illum illic curaverit; Hec. 218, ut domi mihi vos eritis, proinde ego ero fama foris.

e) With correlative *pariter:* Pacuv. 248, pariter te esse erga illum video, ut illum ted erga scio; Amph. 1019, pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt.

f) Without correlative: Bacch. 815, adstas ut praeco praedicat; 1108, pari fortuna, aetate ut sumus, utimur.

2. The *ut*-clause does not institute a formal comparison, but merely serves as an adverbial modifier of the main clause or of some particular word in it. Correlative words, such as *ita, item, itidem,* are sometimes found in connection with clauses of this class.

a) Without correlative; very frequent.

1) Present tense: Amph. 738, recte dicit ut commeminit; Bacch. 228, faciam ut iubes, and so frequently; Capt. 304, fortuna humana fingit artatque ut lubet; so frequently; Cas. 89, non licere, ut volo, loqui; so often; 405, age ut vis; so frequently: Curc. 235, vivo. : : nempe ut dignus es; Men. 359, fit ut meret; 906, fecit ut mos meretricius est; Merc. 381, haud quicquam inepte feci amantes ut solent; 414, virginem non malam, ut matrem addecet familias; 989, iam ut volt per me sibi habeat; M. G. 1024, age ut tibi maxume concinnumst; 1070, facis ut facere aequom; so often; Poen. 722, esto, ut sinit; Eun. 607, sane hercle, ut dicis; so often; Hec. 603, non tute incommodam rem, ut quaeque est, in animum induces pati? Cato, Agr. 139, uti ius est, precor.

2) Imperfect tense: Merc. 45, vi summa ut quidque poterat rapiebat domum.

3) Future tense: Men. 1152, faciam ut tu voles; Hec. 764, utere ut voles.

4) Perfect tense: Amph. 235, ut voluimus, nostra superat manus; 277, perge ut occepisti; so often; Bacch. 802, ut accepi, ad te attuli; Bacch. 1095, attondit dolis, ut lubitumst; so often; Men. 364, omne paratumst ut iussisti; H. T. 598, dicam, verum ut aliud ex alio incidit; Amph. 1067, ut iacui exsurgo.

5) Pluperfect tense : Amph. 241, quisque ut steterat, iacet; Asin. 413, cur non venisti ut iusseram ? so Cas. 580 ; Merc. 698 ; Pseud. 1117 ; Cas. 897, memora ordine, uti occeperas ; similarly Pers. 809 ; Phor. 814, sic commodius arbitror quam ut coeperas.

6) Future perfect tense : Curc. 707, iam iam faciam ut iusseris ; so Asin. 828 ; Eun. 174 ; Asin. 377, promitto hostire ut merueris.

  b) With correlative *ita :*

1) Present tense : Aul. 298, ita esse ut dicis ; so often ; Capt. 372, ita fers ut decet ; so often ; 388, ita facis ut oportet ; 414, feci ut commemoras ; Cas. 235, nempe ut tu mihi es ; M. G. 633, experior ita esse ut praedicas ; so often ; 775, erus meus ita magnus moechus est ut neminem fuisse aeque credo ; Trin. 948, faciam ita ut te velle video ; H. T. 490, videre vera atque ita uti res est dicere ; 702 ; Eun. 748, educta ita uti te dignumst.

2) Perfect tense : Amph. 775, itast ut obsignavi ; Aul. 65, estne ita ut condidi ; Epid. 622, estne ita ut tibi dixi ? Men. 1038, salvom tibi ita ut mihi dedisti reddibo ; Trin. 857, ut ille me exornavit, ita sum ornatus ; Trin. 897, ita ut occepi dicam ; And. 949, ita ut possedi nil mutat ; Eun. 18, si perget ita ut instituit ; Phor. 169, quod habes, ita ut voluisti, uxorem ; 776 ; Ad. 635, ita ut dixi facite ; Cato, Agr. 118, condito ita uti scriptum est ; 144, 2.

3) Pluperfect tense : And. 542, ut me adiuves atque ita, ut nuptiae fuerant futurae, fiant.

4) Future perfect tense : XII Tab. 5, uti legassit, ita ius esto ; ibid., 6, uti lingua nuncupassit, ita ius esto ; Cato, Agr. 49, 2, ita ut fuerit ponito !

  c) With other correlatives :

1) *Sic :* Bacch. 468, sic est ut loquor ; Cas. 398, utinam tibi sic, uti praedicant, sors deliquerit ; And. 554, sic hercle ut dicam tibi ; Phor. 479, sic habent principia sese ut dixi.

2) *Tam :* Lucil. 408, iam disrumpetur medius, tam (Quicherat ; *iam* codd) ut Marsus colubras disrumpit cantu.

3) *Item :* Cist. 142, sine doloribus item ut aliae pariunt quae malum sibi quaerunt ; Merc. 874, si huc item properes ut istuc pro-peras ; 3, non item facio ut alios vidi ; Cato, Agr. 134, 4, dato item ut prius datum est ; (Jord.) 36, 10, item uti maximos tumultus disieci ;

Agr. 134, 4, obmoveto item uti prius obmoveris; obmoveris item uti prius feceris.

4) With *itidem:* Bacch. 949, itidem Ulixem audivi ut ego sum fuisse et audacem et malum; Rud. 1010, adfligam ad terram te itidem ut piscem soleo; H. T. 698, celabitur itidem ut celata adhuc est; Eun. 93, utinam hoc tibi doleret itidem ut mihi dolet; 385, si eas itidem fallam ut ab illis fallimur; Hec. 150, quin integram itidem reddam ut accepi a suis.

5) With *proinde:* Amph. 517, sic ecflictim amare proinde ut hic te deperit; 558, proinde ut commodumst quicque facias; 757, scio istaec facta proinde ut proloquor; 960, proinde eri ut sint ipse item sit; 973, recte loquere et proinde ut uxorem decet; 981, haec curata sint fac proinde adeo ut velle med intellegis; Frag. ix, nisi hoc factum est proinde ut autumo; Capt. 933, numquam referre gratiam possim proinde ut tu promeritus; Cas. 158, faciam uti proinde ut est dignus vitam colat; Stich. 284, proinde ut decet amat virum suom; 759, proinde ut consuetu's cantionem aliquam occupito.

6) With *perinde:* H. T. 195, haec perinde sunt ut illius animust.

7) With *exinde:* And. Alt. Ex. 17, studium exinde ut erit, existimaveris.

8) With *hoc modo, hoc pacto,* etc.: Rud. 1072, hoc modo res gesta est ut dico; 1253, nullus erat illo pacto ut illi iusserant; Men. 985 ⟨eo⟩ exemplo servio tergo ut in rem esse arbitror; Merc. 265, amavi olim, verum ad hoc exemplum nunquam ut nunc insanio.

9) With *pariter:* Aul. 22, filium pariter moratum ut pater fuit; Titin. 79, ne tu istum edepol extulisti pariter ut dignus fuit.

10) *Idem:* Hec. 544, ut te olim ostendisti eadem esse nil cessavisti; Capt. 778, eodem pacto ut servi solent coniciam pallium.

11) With *adaeque:* Cist. 55, neque munda adaeque es ut soles.

12) *Adsimulo ut:* Bacch. 962, id periclum adsimulo, Ulixem ut praedicant esse proditum.

13) Cas. 860, nec fallaciam astutiorem ullus fecit poeta atque ut haec est facta.

3. The *ut*-clause stands in appositional relation to the contents of the main clause, which often has *ita, item, itidem,* or some other correlative particle.

a) Without correlative:

1) Present tense: e.g. Bacch. 186, cenam pollicere, ut convenit; 1039, ut opinor, dem; so often; Capt. 25, ut fit in bello, capitur alter filius; so often; 123, avis me ferae consimilem faciam, ut praedicas; so often; Cas. 85, ut suspicor, ultro ibit; so often; Cist. 66, quod neque habeo neque quisquam alia mulier, ut perhibent viri; Curc. 332, noluit frustrarier, ut decet; Merc. 851, apparatus sum, ut videtis.

2) Perfect tense, e.g. Bacch. 390, illum intellego invenisse, ut servos mihi nuntiavit; Cist. 170, ut audistis, dat; 366, errat, ut ego dixi; so often; Men. 1146, numquid me morare quin liber, ut iusti, siem? Merc. 94, mercis omnis, ut volui, vendidi; M. G. 1028, ad eam rem habeo omnem aciem, uti iam demonstravi; 1144, ut occepistis, date operam adiutabilem; so often; Truc. 203, ut nuntiatumst, hic adfuturum aiunt eum; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 3, ut dixi, periculosum.

3) With pluperfect tense: Capt. 17, fugitivos ille, ut dixeram ante, quem apstulerat, vendidit; Curc. 636, pater meus mihi dedit, ut aequom fuerat; Pers. 576, adduco, ut dudum dixeram; H. T. 500.

b) With *ita:*

1) Present tense, e.g. Stich. 5, quorum negotiis, ita ut aequom est, sollicitae sumus; 30, hic tertius annus — : : ita ut memoras; And. 80, forte, ita ut fit, filium perduxere illuc; so often; H. T. 296, si haec vera sunt, ita uti credo; Ad. 755, ita uti decet, hilarum fac te; Cato, Agr. 157, 7, si uteris, ita uti moneo.

2) Perfect tense, e.g. Curc. 43, ita ut occepi dicere, ei ancillula est; so often; Eun. 207, fac, ita ut iussi, deducantur; so often; Phor. 280, ubi non respondeas, ita ut ille fecit; 908, omnis posthabui mihi res, ita ut par fuit; Ad. 894, quoi dominus curaest, ita ut tibi sensi.

3) Pluperfect tense, e.g. Men. 986, ut iusserat, ita venio advorsum; Eun. 869, ut eam non possim suis, ita ut aequom fuerat, tradere; Phor. 651, amici filiam, ita ut aequom fuerat, volui uxorem ducere.

c) With other correlatives, e.g. Capt. 43, reducem faciet inprudens: itidem ut saepe plus insciens quis fecit quam prudens; Amph. 63, faciam sit, proinde ut dixi, tragicomoedia; Cas. 94, conicito possisne praeripere Casinam uxorem, proinde ut postulas; Trin. 659, tibi, proinde ut (ac, *P*) merere, summas habeo gratias.

4. *Ut; ita . . . ut*, equivalent to *qualis; talis . . . qualis.*

a) *Ut* alone, e.g. Liv. And. 27, facit homones ut prius fuerunt; Amph. 430, eam ut matre fuerat natum vini eduxi meram; Bacch. 399, certamen cernitur sisne ut esse oportet; 724, bellus atque, ut esse optabam, locus; Capt. 228, ero ut voles; 236; M. G. 475, palam est eam esse ut dicis.

b) *Ita . . . ut,* e.g. Bacch. 386, quist amicus ita uti nomen possidet; Cist. 47, si, ut dicis, ita futura es; 48, si ita eris ut volo; so often; Men. 981, si ita ut in rem ducunt sint; ibid. ita ero ut me esse oportet; Merc. 428, mandavit ad illam faciem, ita ut illa est; Stich. 112, si sint ita ut censeo; Trin. 311, nimio satiust ut opust ted ita esse quam ut animo lubet; 620; 1170, ille ita est ut esse nolo; Hec. 604, si cetera ita sunt ut vis; Ad. 161, sed ita ut usquam fuit fide quisquam optuma; Cato, Agr. 144, 2, scalae ita uti datae erunt, reddito!

5. *Ita . . . ut* in asseverations.

a) *Ut* after optative subjunctives: Bacch. 111, ita me di ament, ut videtur; similarly 892; Cas. 452; Curc. 208; Pseud. 943; Stich. 505; H. T. 686; Hec. 579; Ad. 749; Capt. 623, ita faxit, ut non est; 878, ita me condecoret, ut vidi; Curc. 578, ita me amassint, ut tua verba non pluris facio; H. T. 1030, ita mihi sis superstes, ut ex me natus es; Phor. 807, ita me servet Iuppiter ut propior illi nemost.

b) *Ut* after future indicatives expressing a wish: Aul. 761, ita te amabit ut nescis; similarly Merc. 762; H. T. 463; 749.

c) *Ut* after future indicative expressing a mild command or request: Amph. 1, 4, 8, 13, ut voltis, ita huic facietis fabulae silentium.

d) *Ut* alone without correlative *ita* occurs in Amph. 831, per supremi regis regnum iuro, ut nemo corpus contigit.

6. The *ut*-clause indicates proportion, e.g. Naev. Trag. 8, ut quisque est meritus, pretium ferat; Trin. 1173, miserumst male promerita ut merita sunt si ulcisci non licet; Afran. 26, sumpsi non ab illo modo sed ut quisque habuit; Hec. 380, omnibus nobis ut res dant sese, ita magni sumus; Turp. 142, ut quisque minimo contentus fuit, ita fortunatam vitam vixit maxime; Pseud. 679, proinde ut quisque fortuna utitur ita praecellit; Trin. 65, proinde ut bene vivitur, diu vivitur; Stich. 520, ut quoique res paratast, perinde amicis utitur.

7. The *ut*-clause indicates the standard or norm according to which the content of the main clause has validity, e.g. Bacch. 218, ut hanc

rem natam intellego, quod ames paratumst; Capt. 596, pol ego ut
rem video, tu inventus es vera vanitudine qui convincas; 921, ut
adornat, iam nihil est ('at the rate he is making provision'); 990,
ipsust Tyndarus tuos filius, ut quidem hic argumenta loquitur;
Cas. 312, salva spes est, ut verba audio; Cist. 5, ut meus est animus,
fieri non posse arbitror; 194, ut sunt humana, nihil est perpetuom
datum; 717, hanc scire oportet, signa ut dicit; 756, ea est ut
numerus annorum attulit; Curc. 110 a, pol ut praedicas, vindemia
haec huic anu non satis est; Men. 206, iv minae perierunt, ut ratio
redditur; 861, illum metuo, ut minatur, ne quid male faxit; 1117,
vos quot eratis? : : ut nunc memini, duo; 953, quot sunt satis? : :
proinde ut insanire video, quattuor, nihilo minus; Merc. 410, ut nunc
sunt maledicentes homines, uxori meae mihique obiectent lenocinium
facere; Pseud. 596, hi loci sunt, ut ego oculis rationem capio; 784,
ut nunc male metuo, videor posse; 979, ut vestitu's, es perfossor
parietum; 1076, nullumst periclum stipularier, ut concepisti verba;
Rud. 303, ut nunc fluctuat mare, nulla nobis spes est; 901, operam
ludos facit, ut tempestas est atque ut noctu fuit; Trin. 547, istest
ager, ut te audivi loqui, malos in quem mitti decet; 729, ut rem
narras, nullo modo potest fieri; 677; 887, opus factost viatico ad
tuom nomen, ut tu praedicas; Truc. 412, nunc ut praemisit nuntium
miles, non multo post aderit; 775; And. 77, ita ut ingeniumst omnium
ab labore proclive ad lubidinem, accepit condicionem; H. T. 169, ut
diei tempus est, tempust monere; so 212; 551, si evenerit, ut sunt
humana, ut faciat filius; 649, ut omnes sumus religiosae, de digito
anulum detraho; 869, ut istam rem video, istius obsaturabere; 870,
hac uti sunt, cautim dabis; Eun. 525, hanc se intendit esse, uti est
audacia; Phor. 55, non neclexisse habeo gratiam. : : praesertim ut
nunc sunt mores; 638, ut est ille bonus vir, tria non commutabitis
verba; 774, haud scio, ut homost, an mutet animum; 820, laetus
sum, ut meae res sese habent, fratri obtigisse quod volt; Ad. 389,
credo, ut est dementia; 480, hic Geta, ut captus est servorum, non
malus; so Afran. 313; Afran. 4, ut tu rem narras, bona comest cotidie.

   8. *Ut* **causal. In a few instances the** *ut***-clause of the type just
considered develops further a force which is nearly or quite causal.**
The beginnings of this usage may be seen in a clause like Phor. 638,
cited above under 7, ut est ille bonus vir, tria non commutabitis

verba.   Examples of the causal value are: Amph. 329, lassus sum
hercle, navi (*e navi*, codd) ut vectus huc sum; Bacch. 106, nam uti navi
vecta's, credo timida's; Merc. 371, per mare ut vectu's, nunc oculi
terram mirantur; Most. 268, ut speculum tenuisti, metuo ne olant
argentum manus; Pseud. 278, in pauca, ut occupatus nunc sum,
confer; 661, ut lassus veni de via, me volo curare; Truc. 576, pallida
est, ut peperit puerum; Ad. 647, habitant hic quaedam mulieres
pauperculae, ut opinor eas non nosse te; Afran. 72, post narravero,
nunc est distentus animus ut negotiis.

9. *Ut = quanto:* Most. 831, ut quidquid magis contemplo, tanto
magis placet.

10.   Isolated is Asin. 576, num male relatast gratia ut collegam
collaudavi, where the *ut*-clause is explanatory of *gratia.*

11. *Utquomque:* Amph. 343; Epid. 49, utquomque ventust, exim
velum vortitur; so Poen. 754.

Sicut-Clauses.

Sicut with the indicative occurs in the following classes of clauses:

1. One act or state is compared in its entirety with another: Capt.
934, et poteris et ego potero, sicut tu huic potes facere merito max-
ume; M. G. 727, sicut merci pretium statuit probus agoranomus,
itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit; Trin. 547,
istest ager in quem omnis malos mitti decet, sicut fortunatorum
memorant insulas quo cuncti qui aetatem egerint caste conveniant;
Acc. 403, sicut perfremunt delphini, item ad auris cantum refert.

2. The *sicut*-clause does not institute a formal comparison, but
merely serves as an adverbial modifier of the main clause or of some
particular word in it: Aul. 294, nempe sicut dicis; Bacch. 718, sicut
dicis; Most. 771, haec sunt sicut praedico; Trin. 685, sicut dixi faciam.

3. The *sicut*-clause stands in appositional relation to the contents
of the main clause: Bacch. 712, geritote amicis vostris aurum corbi-
bus, sicut animus sperat; 1084a, viso ecquid eum ad virtutem opera
sua compulerit, sicut scio fecisse; Capt. 696, si rebitet, sicut confido
fore; Rud. 1111, quibuscum periit, sicuti dixi; Trin. 805, set clan-
culum, sicut praecepi; Cato, Agr. 141, 3, harum rerum ergo, sicuti
dixi, macte esto.

4. *Sicut,* 'as for example': Bacch. 548, se quom frustrant, frus-

trari alios stolidi existumant; sicut est hic; Capt. 498, quid est
suavius quam bene rem gerere bono publico, sicut ego feci? Cas. 563,
stultitia magna est ad forum procedere; sicut ego feci; Men. 585, eis
ubi dicitur dies, simul patronis dicitur; sicut me sollicitum cliens
quidam habuit; M. G. 514, ita sum coactus ut nesciam utrum me
expostulare tecum aequiust, — . . . sicut etiam nunc nescio; Most.
381, miserum est igitur demum fodere puteum ubi sitis faucis tenet;
sicut ego nunc quaero; 412, id viri doctist opus, tranquille cuncta ut
proveniant; sicut ego efficiam; Poen. 504, tardo amico nihil est
nequius, praesertim homini amanti . . . sicut ego hos duco advocatos;
1192a, ut volup est homini, si quod agit cluet victoria; sicut nos inter
alias praestitimus pulchritudine.

5. *Sicut = qualis:* Most. 544, nihil est miserius quam animus con-
scius, sicut me habet.

6. *Sicut* with causal, or partly causal force: Epid. 271, nunc
occasiost faciundi prius quam advenerit, sicut cras hic aderit; 544,
sin est homo, sicut anni multi dubiam dant; M. G. 974, illam iube
adire, sicut soror venit; Pers. 135, alium adlegavero qui esse se
peregrinum praedicet, sicut istic leno non vi menses Megaribus huc
est quom commigravit; Pseud. 373, nisi attulerit miles v minas,
sicut haec est praestituta summa ei argento dies, posse opinor facere
me officium meum.

7. In asseverations: Asin. 16, sicut tuom vis unicum gnatum tuae
superesse vitae, ita ted optestor per senectutem tuam.

Velut-Clauses.

1. *Velut,* 'just as,': Enn. Ann. 304, concurrunt veluti venti;
Lucil. 245, veluti videmus, sic est; 812, velut auceps ille facit.

2. *Velut,* 'as for example': Aul. 460, facinus audax incipit qui
cum opulento pauper homine rem habere; veluti Megadorus temp-
tat me omnibus modis; Curc. 681, non male creditur qui numquam
reddunt, sed prosum perit; velut x minas dum solvit omnis mensas
transiit; Merc. 225, di hominibus miris exemplis somnia in somnis
danunt, velut ego in somnis egi; so also Rud. 593; Most. 705, omni-
bus ire dormitum odio est, velut nunc mihi certa res est ut abeam
potius quam domi cubem; Pseud. 767, quoi servitutem di danunt
lenoniam puero, ne illi malam rem magnam danunt; velut haec mi

evenit servitus; Truc. 244, datores novos oportet quaerere, velut hic
agrestis est adulescens, probus dator; 571, des quantumvis, nusquam
apparet; velut haec meretrix meum erum intulit in pauperiem;
Pacuv. 374, id magis veri simile esse usus edocet; velut Orestes
modo fuit rex, factust mendicus modo.

    3. *Consimilis velut :* Poen. 824, quoi homini erus est consimilis velut
ego habeo nunc.

<p style="text-align:center">Praeut.</p>

    Examples: Amph. 374, perii. : : parum etiam, praeut futurumst,
praedicas; Bacch. 929, non pedibus termento fuit praeut erum
expugnabo; Men. 935, Nestor nunc est, praeut dudum fuit; Merc.
470, nugas maxumas fuisse credo, praeut quo pacto ego divorsus dis-
trahor; M. G. 19, nihil hoc quidemst praeut alia dicam; Eun. 301,
ludum dicet fuisse illum, praeut huius rabies quae dabit.

<p style="text-align:center">Quasi = Sicut.</p>

    Quasi seems to be used only to introduce clauses in formal com-
parisons, where the content of one clause is likened to that of another:
Aul. 595, quasi pueri qui nare discunt scirpea induitur ratis, eodem
modo servom ratem esse ero aequom censeo; Capt. 80, quasi cocleae
latent, item parasiti latent; 1002, quasi pueris monedulae dantur,
itidem mi haec upupa datast; Merc. 695, coquos, quasi solet hortator
remiges hortarier, ita hortabatur; Rud. 1008, te, itidem quasi peniculus
novos exurgeri solet, exurgebo; Pseud. 199, quasi Dircam olim de-
vinxere ad taurum, item te distringam ad carnarium; 401, quasi poeta
quaerit, reperit, facit, poeta fiam; 955, ut transvorsus cedit, quasi
cancer solet; Stich. 539, ei filiae duae erant, quasi nunc meae sunt;
ibid. fuit, quasi ego sum, senex; 540, erant duobus nuptae fratribus,
quasi nunc meae sunt vobis; 543, caeleps erat, quasi ego nunc sum;
545, senex dixit, quasi ego nunc tibi dico; 549, quis istuc dicit? an
ille quasi tu? : : quasi ego nunc dico; Plaut. Frag. 79, agite nunc,
quasi solent triarii; Com. Frag. p. 144, Ribb., quasi messor unum
quemque spicum collegit.

<p style="text-align:center">Quam-Clauses.[1]</p>

    1. *Tam . . . quam.*
    a) With adjectives or adverbs: Bacch. 767, tam frictum illum
reddam quam frictum est cicer; Capt. 475, tam aperto capite ad

---

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 62 ff.

lenones eunt quam sontes condemnant; 639, tam satis quam numquam
hoc invenies secus; Cas. 759, nec credo usquam ludos tam festivos
fieri quam hic fiunt ludi seni nostro; Men. 1063, tam consimilest
quam potest; Merc. 186, tam certe quam ego te aut tu me vides;
956, tam propitiam reddam quam quom propitiast Iuno Iovi; M. G.
240, tam simile quam lacte lactist; 457, tam east quam potis nostra
erilis concubina; Most. 44, neque tam facetis quam tu vivis victibus;
559, tam facile vinces quam pirum volpes comest; 751, tam liquidust
quam liquida esse tempestas solet; Poen. 355, tam tranquillum quam
mare olimst; Stich. 454, tam confido quam potis; Trin. 541, oves
tam glabrae quam haec est manus; 574, numquam tam exspectatus
filius natus quam illuc est 'spondeo' natum mihi; Ad. 849, tam ex-
coctam reddam quam carbost; Eun. 211, utinam tam aliquid invenire
facile possis quam hoc peribit.

b) *Tam . . . quam* alone: Capt. 312, tam ille apud nos servit quam
ego apud te servio; Ad. 278, non tam quidem quam vis.

2. *Ita . . . quam :* Curc. 326, ita me amabit quam ego amo.

3. *Aeque . . . quam :* Epid. 306, nullum esse opinor agrum aeque
feracem quam est noster Periphanes; M. G. 465, qui aeque faciat confi-
denter quicquam quam mulier facit; Stich. 274, numquam aeque patri
suo nuntium lepidum attulit quam ego nunc meae erae nuntiabo.

4. **Quam alone without correlative**: Capt. 421, hau centensumam
partem laudat quam meritust; Rud. 943, non pisces expeto quam
tui sermonis sum indigens; Stich. 721, quam vis desubito vel cadus
vorti potest.

5. Peculiar is Truc. 324, si proinde amentur, mulieres diu quam
lavant, omnes amantes balneatores sient.

6. **After comparatives :**

a) No correlative: Merc. 232, posterius quam mercatus fueram,
visus sum in custodelam concredere; Asin. 63, posterius dicis quam
credo tibi; Bacch. 630a, mortuos pluris pretist quam ego sum; so also
with *plus:* Cas. 243; 356; Cist. 122; Epid. 66; Men. 592; Merc. 491;
M. G. 651; Rud. 453; 504; Trin. 51; Truc. 64; 296; 374; 755;
H. T. 659, plus spei video quam volo; Phor. 584; Acc. 157, vereor
plus quam fas est; 152; Capt. 118, omnes liberi lubentius sumus
quam servimus; so also with *lubentius :* Epid. 380; Men. 979;
Capt. 425, non magis quam experiar persequi; so also with *magis :*

Curc. 305; Cist. 654; Merc. 619; M. G. 615; 1086; Pers. 305; Poen.
1194; Stich. 8a; Truc. 720; Acc. 355, te conmiserabam magis
quam miserebar mei; Capt. 430, minus dixi quam volui; so also
with *minus:* Merc. 424; Pseud. 956; Stich. 498; Truc. 322; 452;
673; Eun. 1027, qui minus quam Hercules servivit Omphalae?
Phor. 11; 787; Cas. 1008, lepidiorem uxorem nemo quam ego habeo
hanc habet; Cist. 533, perdam operam potius quam carebo; Most.
229, venibit potius quam sinam egere; Curc. 256, meliorem quam ego
sum suppono tibi; so also with *melior, melius:* Most. 695; Stich. 157;
Ad. 295, melius fieri haud potuit quam factumst; Afran. 3, omnem
melius rem callere quam volo; Curc. 593, mulierem peiorem quam
haec est; so also with *peior, peius:* Most. 709; Pers. 153; Poen.
825; Pseud. 1017; Stich. 109; 125; Men. 1089, similius quam hic
tui est; so also M. G. 551; M. G. 22, gloriarum pleniorem quam illic
est; so also 513; M. G. 1, curate ut splendor sit clarior quam solis
radii esse solent; 664, leniorem dices quam mutum est mare liqui-
diusculusque ero quam ventus est; Most. 532, scelestiorem annum
numquam ullum vidi quam hic annus obtigit; 824, multum improbiores
sunt quam credidi; Pers. 442, citius abeunt quam in cursu rotula
circumvortitur; Poen. 507, tardiores quam corbitae sunt; 586, doc-
tiores sunt quam hi sunt; 694, curer mollius quam oculi curari
solent; Pseud. 670, non potuit mi opportunius advenire quam haec
allatast mi epistula; Rud. 20, maiore multa multat quam litem
auferunt; Stich. 343, nullum nequiorem quam hic est; Trin. 459,
benigniorem quam nunc experior esse confido fore; Truc. 627,
machaeram longiorem habes quam haec est; 635, quo pacto excludi
potui planius quam exclusus nunc sum? H. T. 681, ut frugalior sim
quam volt; Eun. 527, Thais quam ego sum maiusculast; Phor. 349,
enumquam contumeliosius quam haec est (facta) mihi? 438, si attige-
ris secus quam dignumst; 808, ut propior illi quam ego sum, nemost;
Ad. 211, numquam vidi iniquius certationem comparatam quam haec
fuit; 834, attentiores sumus quam sat est; Plaut. Frag. 43, nil feci
secus quam me decet.

b) With correlatives:

1) Type *quam magis . . . tam magis:* Poen. 348, quam magis
aspecto, tam magis est nimbata; Bacch. 1091, magis quam reputo, tam
magis uror.

2) Type *quam magis . . . magis:* Bacch. 1076, quam magis foveo, magis curaest; Trin. 861, quam magis specto, minus placet.

3) Type *quam magis . . . tam:* Asin. 158, quam magis te capessis, tam aestus te refert.

7. After words implying a comparative: Merc. 297, bis tanto valeo quam valui; M. G. 1082, postriduo natus sum quam Iuppiter natust; si hic pridie natus foret quam illest; Cato, Agr. 113, 1, hoc facito pridie quam voles; Pseud. 1239, alio pacto quam fit; Pers. 366, quae praeter sapiet quam placet parentibus; Rud. 587, quam potavi praeter animi quam lubuit sententiam; Merc. 23, nec quisquam sine grandi malo prae quam res patitur studuit elegantiae; Most. 981, nihil hoc quidem est prae quam alios sumptus facit; H. T. 59, mihi videre praeter aetatem tuam facere et praeter quam res te adhortatur tua; Cato (Jord.), 8, 17, ea (fana) exauguravit praeterquam, quod Termino fanum erat, id nequitum exugurari; CIL, i, 196, 24, quei arvorsum ead fecisent quam suprad scriptum est.

8. With superlatives:

a) Type *quam plurimum potest:* Cato, Agr. 157, 15, subducito quam plurimum poteris; Truc. 847, uxorem quam primum potest, abduce; Men. 834, concede quam potest longissume; Capt. 398, ut remittat : : . . . . : : at quam primum pote.

b) Type *quam maxume est . . . tam facillime:* H. T. 997, quam maxume huic vana haec suspicio erit, tam facillume pacem conficiet; Ad. 501, quam vos facillume agitis, tam maxume oportet; Cato, Agr. 64, 2, quam citissime conficies, tam maxume expediet; ibid. quam diutissime in amurca erit, tam deterrimum erit; 65, 1, quam acerbissima olea oleum facies, tam oleum optumum erit; 157, 8, quam plurimum ederit, tam citissime sanus fiet; Frag. (Jord.) 85, 9, veternosus quam plurimum bibit, tam maxume sitit.

c) Type *quam citissume potest . . . tam:* Capt. 352, quam citissime potest, tam hoc cedere ad factum volo.

d) Type *quam restito . . . tam maxume:* Merc. 122, quam restito, tam maxume res in periclo vortitur; M. G. 781, quam potis tam verba confer maxume ad compendium!

9. *Quam si, quasi*: CIL, i, 196, 29, exstrad quam sei quid ibei sacri est; so i, 198, 72; Cato, Agr. 144, 4, ne quis concedat extra quam si quem socium dixerit; Enn. Trag. 184, otio qui nescit uti, plus negoti

habet quam quom est negotium in negotio; Poen. 240, cogita item nos perhiberi quam si salsa muriatica esse autumantur; Pseud. 641, magis erit solutum quasi ipsi dederis.   In Merc. 1023, Seyffert's conjecture *quasi* for *si* is usually read : plus perdet quasi praehi-buerit palam.

10. *Tamquam = sicut :* Eun. 263, si potis est, tamquam philoso-phorum habent disciplinae ex ipsis vocabula, parasiti ita ut Gna-thonici vocentur.

Clauses Introduced by *Atque,* 'as,' 'than.'

1. *Proinde ac :* Amph. 583, te ego faciam proinde ac meritus es.

2. *Pariter ac :* Phor. 786, pariter nunc opera me adiuves ac re dudum opitulata es.

3. *Talis ac :* Phor. 1028, faxo tali sit mactatus atque hic est infor-tunio.

4. *Aeque, adaeque ac :* Aul. 297, pumex non aeque est ardus atque hic est senex; Cas. 128, numquam ieiunium ieiunumst aeque atque te reddibo; Phor. 581, te mihi fidelem esse aeque atque egomet sum mihi scibam.

5. *Similis atque :* Phor. 31, ne simili utamur fortuna atque usi sumus.

6. **Without correlative** : Bacch. 549, sicut est hic quem esse ami-cum ratus sum atque ipsus sum mihi; M. G. 164, haud centensumam partem dixi atque possum.

7. **With comparatives**: Merc. 897, amicior mihi nullus vivit atque is est.

8. **With** *alius, aliter, etc.:* Pseud. 474, alio modo atque te soleo; H. T. 264, aliter tuom amorem atque est accipis; Eun. 82, neve alior-sum atque ego feci acceperit; Phor. 530, nilo sum aliter ac fui; Phor. 684, aliud mihi respondes ac rogo; Hec. 365, alio suspicans morbo me visurum adfectam ac sensi; 375, nec voce alia ac res mo-nebat ipsa poterat conqueri; Ad. 597, numquam te aliter atque es esse animum induxi.

9. *Atque uti :* Amph. 274, neque se luna mutat atque uti exortast semel; cf. 1019, pariter hoc fit atque ut alia facta sunt.

INDICATIVE IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS.[1]

The use of the indicative in indirect questions was earlier than the employment of the subjunctive in such clauses, and originated in such paratactic expressions as Curc. 166, eloquere! quid est? Bacch. 816, responde! quis me vendit? 749, obsecro, quid usust? In many instances it is obviously impossible to determine whether the question is dependent or independent. Similarly in expressions like: *eloquar ut factumst*, we may have either an indirect question, or a dependent relative clause, — either, 'I will tell you how it happened,' or 'I will recount it to you as it happened.' But quite apart from such ambiguities as those alluded to, we have a large number of clear cases of indirect questions in the indicative. Like indirect questions in the subjunctive, these fall into pronominal questions and sentence questions. In a few instances we have indicative indirect questions which are deliberative.

PRONOMINAL QUESTIONS.

Like indirect questions in the subjunctive, these pronominal questions in the indicative are introduced by various interrogative pronouns and adverbs. Thus:

1. **Introduced by** *quis* (87), e.g. Amph. 17, quoius iussu venio dicam; Bacch. 473, omnem rem scio quem ad modumst; 861, audin quae loquitur? Capt. 206 a, scimus nos nostrum officium quod est; 207, sentio quam rem agitis; 592, audin quid ait? Cist. 82, qua accersitae caussa estis eloquar; Men. 349, videamus qui egreditur; 425, scin quid te amabo ut facias? 472, opserva quid dabo; Merc. 431, nescis quid dicturus sum; 783, dicam id quid est; M. G. 377, mirumst facinus quo modo transire potuit; Most. 505, quae monstra fiunt vix possum eloqui; 1039, narravero quibus exemplis med ludificatus est; Pers. 291, specta quid dedero; 638, quaeras qui fuit; Poen. 1185, ingeniis quibus sumus gnosco; Pseud. 18, fac me certum quid tibist; 261, nosce hunc quis est; Rud. 355, non audivisti quo pacto voluit? 592, lenonem quid agit visam; 946, quin loquere quid vis? 1102, expedi quid postulas; Stich. 410, videto quid potest pecunia; H. T.

[1] Becker, De Syntaxi interrogationum obliquarum apud priscos Scriptores Latinos, Studemund's Studien, i, p. 115 ff. For a radical view of these clauses, see Gaffiot, Le Vrai Latin (1908). G. takes *quid* as a relative!

494, scin quid volo? 600, vide quod inceptat facinus; 649, qua hoc occeptumst causa, loquere; Eun. 99, qua gratia iussi ausculta; 338, scin quid volebam; 1037, audin hic quid ait? Hec. 405, quae futurast vita quom in mentem venit; Stat. 216, vide quid fert morum similitas.

At times we find the indicative and subjunctive combined in coördinate clauses, e.g. Cist. 56, eloquere et quid est et quid velis; Most. 199, vides quae sim et quae ante fui; Pers. 514, nescis quid te instet boni, neque quam tibi Fortuna faculam adlucere volt; And. 649, nescis quantis in malis vorser quantasque hic conflavit sollicitudines; Amph. 17.

2. Introduced by *ut* (51) especially after *vide, viden,* etc., e.g. Asin. 598, audin ut largus est? Bacch. 202, scis ut confringi solet; 492, viden ut aegre patitur? 1130; Curc. 93; Curc. 126, vide ut ingurgitat; 153, hoc vide ut dormiunt; 311, viden ut expalluit; Men. 808, scibo ex hoc ut factumst; 919, audin ut deliramenta loquitur? Merc. 481, satin ut oblitus fui? M. G. 1289, mitto iam ut occidi Achilles civis passus est; Most. 811, non tu vides hunc voltu uti tristi est? Pseud. 1312, ut quidque egisti scio; Rud. 1211, eloquere ut haec res optigit; Trin. 749, edoceam ut res se habet; Truc. 851, ut factumst fecit omnem rem palam; And. Alt. Ex. 14, me repperisse ut habitus fui; Eun. 670, illud vide os ut sibi distorsit; Ad. 228, illud vide ut oppressit; 513, ut res gestast narrabo; 559; Acc. 303, viden ut te inpietas stimulat? Turp. 103, viden ut fastidit mei? 104, viden ut osculatur?

3. Introduced by *quam* (19), e.g. Amph. 360, vide quam mox vapulare vis; 507, observatote quam blande mulieri palpabitur; Capt. 557, viden quam inimico voltu intuitur; M. G. 64: Most. 458, non potest dici quam indignum facinus fecisti; 829, specta quam arte dormiunt; Pers. 139, scin quam potest? Stich. 702, in mentem venit quam cynice accipimur; H. T. 638, quam bene prospectumst cogita; Hec. 90, non dici potest quam cupida eram huc redeundi; 223; 417; 471, idque si nunc memorare velim quam fideli animo fui; 646, nequeo quam videtur factum prave proloqui; 683.

4. Introduced by *ubi* (3): Aul. 63, ne persentiscat ubist apsconditum; Bacch. 203, dic ubi ea nunc est; Hec. 84, dic mihi ubi te oblectasti.

5. Introduced by *quantus* (9), e.g. Bacch. 663, lubet scire quantum

erus sibi dempsit; M. G. 1074, non scis quantum honorem debeo; Pseud. 1184, commemora quanti conductast; Phor. 247, incredibile quantum erum ante eo sapientia; 986, vide quantum valet; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 23, 13, cogitate quanto cautius facimus.

6. Introduced by *quo* (3): Stich. 541, miror quo evasurust apologus; Trin. 938, lubet experiri quo evasurust; Eun. 237, em quo redactus sum.

7. Introduced by *qui*: only Phor. 398, cedo qui est cognata. Pseud. 866, qui possum? doce, is probably not dependent.

8. Introduced by *unde*: Amph. 424, nescio unde haec huc spectavit; Cist. 748, eloquere unde haec sunt.

9. Introduced by *uter*: Men. 779, loquere uter meruistis culpam; Ad. 195, nunc vide utrum vis.

10. Introduced by *cur*: only Poen. 353 (rogasne), cur iratus est?

11. Introduced by *quam ob rem* (3): Rud. 427, quam ob rem sum missa tu mi aias; And. Alt. Ex. 6, quam ob rem non volui eloquar; Phor. 798, ecquid locutu's cum istac quam ob rem hanc ducimus?

12. Introduced by *quapropter*: only Men. 714, non tu scis quapropter canem esse praedicabant?

13. Introduced by *qua*: only Most. 969, scio qua me ire oportet.

14. Introduced by *si* (23), e.g. Amph. 772, illud miror si habet pateram; Aul. 620, perscrutabor fanum, si inveniam; Bacch. 529, ibo ut visam ad eum si fortest domi; Cas. 591, viso huc amator si rediit; Cist. 651, sciat si possum; Curc. 701, animum advortite si possum; Men. 142; 1048, ibo intro si possum exorare; Poen. 1064, memoradum; si novi forte aut si sunt cognati; Trin. 763, vide consilium si placet; Trin. 921; Eun. 545, idque adeo visam si domist; 838; Phor. 553, vide si quid potes; 674, me certiorem face si illam dant; Ad. 154, volo scire si apud forum est; 239, vide si satis placet.

SENTENCE QUESTIONS.

Dependent sentence questions in the indicative are rare in Early Latin. I have noted only the following instances: Aul. 65, ibo ut visam estne ita ut condidi; M. G. 514, ita sum coactus ut nesciam utrum aequiust; Pseud. 935, viden satin condecet; Rud. 948, vide num quispiam consequitur; And. 878, vide num eius color pudoris signum

indicat; Turp. 129, hoc quaero, ignoscere istic solentne; 171; dic
mihi an oblita, obsecro, es eius crebras mansiones.

DEPENDENT DELIBERATIVE QUESTIONS.

Dependent deliberative questions in the subjunctive may be either
pronominal or sentence questions. The few instances of dependent
deliberatives in the indicative are all pronominal. I have noted only
Stich. 706, vide quot cyathos bibimus; Acc. 191, dubito quid agis;
Epid. 274, quin tu eloquere quid faciemus.

CAUSAL CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOD*.[1]

1. Adverbial clauses (36).

a) *Quod* alone (27), Bacch. 523, neu ei suscenseat quod eum ludi-
ficatus est; Capt. 349, meo periculo experiar fidem quod me esse scit
benivolum; Epid. 630, si remoratus es quod ista voluit; M. G. 502,
nisi supplicium datur quod meas confregisti imbrices, quod inspecta-
visti, quod tractavisti; 1412, iura te non nociturum nemini quod hic
verberatu's aut quod verberabere (in 1414 we have the subjunctive
in a similar expression: me nociturum nemini quod vapularim);
H. T. 58, facit ut te moneam quod mihi videre praeter aetatem tuam
facere; 132, aut etiam amplius quod illa aetas magis idoneast; 888,
quod se adsimulat, id dicis? 1017, quid metuis ne non convincas esse
illum tuom?:: quod filiast inventa? Eun. 434, purgon ego me de istac
Thaidi quod eam me amare suspicatast? Hec. 368, laetae exclamant
'venit,' id quod me repente adspexerant; Ad. 809, tu illos duo olim
pro re tollebas tua quod satis putabas tua bona fore; Naev. Com. 32,
asseri laudes ago, quom votis me multat meis, quod audibam; Cato
(Jord.), 19, 11, atque quod sanguen defluxerat cognovere; 48, 1, quod
tu sacra stata, sollemnia capite sancta deseruisti; 85, 6, quod iter
longius arduiusque erat a Curia; Titin. 155, laudor quod osculavi;
Afran. 116, proba et pudica quod sum, consulo et parco mihi; 210,
defessa expectando domi sedi quod spisso venire visust mihi; Lucil.
26, non tango quod avarus homo est; 123, quod sumptum atque
epulas victu proponis honesto; 145, si minus delectat quod technion

[1] Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Conjunctionen *quod* und *quia* im älteren Latein,
1880; Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, 1892, pp. 20 ff.

Eisocratium est; 388, nupturum te nupta negas quod vivere Ulixem
speras? 662, quod te intromisi gratiam referas mihi; 665, cohibet
domi se, Albinus repudium quod filiae remisit; Acc. Praet. 8, quod
periti sumus in vita atque usu callemus magis; Laelius, Meyer, p.
208, neque tanta dis inmortalibus gratia haberi potest quod is in hac
civitate natus est.

b) With a correlative *idcirco*: And. 690, idcirco accersor quod
sensit; Lucil. 442, tibi istaec res si idcirco est cordi quod rere utilem.

c) With a correlative *ideo*: only Cato (Jord.), 12, 7, ideo graviscae
dictae sunt quod gravem aërem sustinent.

d) With correlative *propterea* (4): Amph. 297, propterea quod
meus erus fecit ut vigilarem, hic pugnis faciet ut dormiam; And. 37,
feci ut esses libertus propterea quod servibas liberaliter; 583, ut me
deluderes propterea quod amat filius; Cato (Jord.), 44, 1, propterea
quod plures venerant.

e) With correlative *eapropter*: only And. 959, deorum vitam eaprop-
ter sempiternam esse arbitror, quod voluptates eorum propriae sunt.

2. Substantive *quod*-clauses. These are partly 'because'-clauses,
partly 'that'-clauses.

a) 'Because'-clauses: Amph. 116, ne hunc ornatum admiremini,
quod processi cum servili schema; Asin. 315, mirabar quod scapulae
gestibant; Bacch. 1072, ne miremini quod non triumpho; so also with
mirari: Merc. 782; Poen. 1373; Rud. 578, an te paenitet in mari
quod elavi, ni in terra iterum eluam? Especially in apposition with
neuter pronouns and nouns: Bacch. 1019, quaeso ut sat habeas id,
quod Chrysalus me obiurigavit; Most. 16, rus mihi tu obiectas?::
sane hoc, credo, quod scis; Truc. 457, mater dicta quod sum, eo[1]
magis studeo vitae; H. T. 910, istuc times quod ille operam amico
dat? Eun. 81, vereor ne illud gravius tulerit quod intro missus non
est; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 15, Rhodiensibus id oberit, quod non male
fecerunt; Hec. 780, ob eam rem[1] iratus est, quod peperit clam; Cato
(Jord.), 24, 14, sed si honorem non aequom est haberi ob eam rem
quod bene facere voluisse quis dicit; And. 904, una quaevis causa
monet, vel tu vel quod verumst vel quod cupio; Eun. 145, multae
sunt causae: primum quod soror est dicta.

[1] Clauses following *eo, ob eam rem*, are only formally different from clauses fol-
lowing *idcirco*, etc., which were classed as adverbial.

b) 'That'-clauses:

1) In apposition with neuter pronouns: Asin. 262, quid hoc, quod picus ulmum tundit? 265, quid illuc quod currit huc? Ad. 210, quid istuc, Sannio, est quod te audio nescio quid concertasse cum ero? Pacuv. 143, quid quod mihi piget paternum nomen profari? Capt. 357, hoc quidem haud molestumst quod collus collari caret; 358, quod bonis bene fit beneficium, gratia ea (by attraction for *id*) gravida est bonis; Merc. 553, id iam lucrum est quod vivis; 596, id vitium est quod tardus est; And. 764, mitte id quod scio; Hec. 236, non signi hoc sat est, quod heri nemo voluit admittere? Acc. 345, dum illud, quod miser est, clam esse censet alteros; Stat. 174, unum id sat est, quod diu vivendo multa quae non volt videt.

2) With substantives: Merc. 692, parumne est malai rei quod amat Demipho? Pacuv. 277, parum est quod te aetas male habet? Bacch. 1008, tantum flagitium te scire audivi meum, quod cum cubui uxore militis; M. G. 1233, iste metus me macerat quod ille fastidiosus est; H. T. 399, omnes mihi labores fuere quos cepi leves, praeterquam tui carendum quod erat; Ad. 953, vitium commune omniumst, quod nimium attenti sumus; Trag. Inc. Ribb. p. 306, sive est calamitas quod expulisti saucios patrio lare; Cato (Jord.), 22, 2, mihi magnae curae est quod haec res tam secunde processit; 37, 2, (ubi mea oratio scripta erat) de ea re quod sponsionem feceram.

3) With verbs: And. 710, non satis habes, quod tibi dieculam addo? Cato (Jord.), 10, 1, neque satis habuit quod eam in occulto vitiaverat; M. G. 468, nimis beat quod commeatus transtinet; Truc. 581, haud perit quod illum amo; Eun. 926, ut mittam quod ei amorem difficillimum confeci sine molestia; 1002, numquam quicquam quod magis vellem evenire mi evenit quam quod senex intro venit; Ad. 307, quem neque fides neque misericordia repressit neque quod partus instabat; Phor. 168, ut ne addam quod sine sumptu ingenuam, liberalem nactus es, quod habes uxorem; Acc. 209, adde huc quod caelestum pater prodigium misit; Aul. 624, non temere est quod corvos cantat mihi; Phor. 998, non temerest quod tu tam times; Enn. Ann. 366, haud temerest quod gubernas.

3. Further peculiarities in the use of *quod*.

a) *Quod*, 'as to the fact that,' occurs in the following passages: Capt. 586, filium tuom quod redimere se ait, id ne utiquam mihi

placet; Pseud. 101, quod tu istis lacrumis te probare postulas, non
pluris refert quam si; Truc. 471, ego quod mala sum, matris opera
mala sum; H. T. 16, quod rumores distulerunt, multas contaminasse
Graecas: id esse factum non negat; 22, quod malivolus poeta dicti-
tat, repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse, arbitrium vostrum
valebit; 204, quod illum insimulat durum, id non est; Eun. 64, quod
nunc tecum cogitas, 'ego illam, quae illum, quae me non. . . . !' haec
verba una falsa lacrimula restinguet; Hec. 437, quod constitui hodie
conventurum eum, non posse, ne me frustra exspectet; 581, teque
ante quod me amare rebar, ei rei firmasti fidem; SC de philosophis et
rhetoribus (161 B. C.), Bruns[6], 37, quod verba facta sunt de philo-
sophis et rhetoribus, de ea re ita censuerunt.

b) *Quod,* 'in that,' occurs: Most. 303, certe ego, quod ego te amo,
operam nusquam melius potui ponere; Acc. Praet. 36, quod dexterum
cepit cursum, pulcherrume auguratum est.

c) *Nisi quod:* Capt. 394, nisi quod custodem habeo, liberum me
esse arbitror; 621, neque mi esse ullum morbum nisi quod servio;
Pers. 517, tantundem scio quantum tu, nisi quod pellegi prior; H. T.
958, qui nescio nec rationem capio, nisi quod tibi bene volo.

d) In Bacch. 668, numqui nummi exciderunt, quod sic terram
optuere? the expression seems elliptical.   The *quod*-clause really
gives the reason for the speaker's asking the question, — 'I ask this
because you keep your gaze upon the ground.'   Cf. Cicero, in Cat. i,
6, 16, quae quidem quibus abs te initiata sacris ac devota sit, nescio,
quod eam necesse putas esse in consulis corpore defigere.

e) In Amph. 303, iam pridem videtur factum heri quod homines
quattuor in soporem collocastis, *quod* is used like *quom* in similar
expressions; see p. 85.   The change from *quod* to *quom* would
involve hiatus.   Unless we make this change, we must recognize an
unexampled use of *quod.*

Causal Clauses introduced by *QUIA.*

The *quia*-clauses in Early Latin fall into three main classes: 1)
dependent on verbs; 2) in answer to questions; 3) substantive *quia*-
clauses.

1. **The governing verb is expressed (140).**
a) Without correlative.

1) Present tense, (60) e.g. Amph. 640, sola videor quia abest;
Asin. 189, quia nil habes, postulas; Aul. 105, discrucior animi quia
abeundumst mihi; Capt. 203, at nos pudet quia cum catenis sumus;
259, neque pol tibi nos, quia nos servas, aequomst vitio vortere;
Cas. 397, quia tute es fugitivos, omnis te imitari cupis? 700, ingra-
tiis, quia non volt, nubet hodie; Cist. 83, quia nolo, obsecutast; Ep.
77, quia perire solus nolo, te cupio perire mecum; Men. 513, omnis
cinaedos esse censes, quia tu es? M. G. 868, quia Sceledrus dormit,
hunc ablegavit; Most. 499, me recipere Orcus noluit, quia praemature
vita careo; 1116, quia placeo, exemplum expetis; 1132, etiam inrides?
:: quian ire autumo? Poen. 101, quia amare cernit, tangere hominem
volt bolo; Truc. 707, salvos sum quia pereo; And. 242, id mutavit,
quia me inmutatum videt? Eun. 167, eunuchum dixti velle te, quia
solae utuntur his reginae; 282, tibi patent fores, quia istam ducis;
Phor. 162, aliis quia defit quod amant, aegrest; tibi quia superest,
dolet; Hec. 215, an quia ruri crebro esse soleo, nescire arbitramini;
Ad. 393, non quia ades, dico haec; Cato (Jord.), 73, 4, vitio vortunt
quia multa egeo; at ego illis quia nequeunt egere.

There is one instance of the historical present: Rud. 366, insilui-
mus, quia videmus. Also one example of the present referring to the
future: M. G. 1331, quia abit, animo male factum est.

2) With imperfect: Amph. 352, quia nos eramus peregri, tu-
tatust domi; Capt. 20; M. G. 54, peditastelli quia erant, sivi viverent;
Vid. 71, te abire iussi, quia me miserebat tui; Eun. 620, id faciebat,
quia tempus non erat; Hec. 16; Enn. Trag. 208, nominatur Argo, quia
Argivi in ea vecti petebant pellem inauratam.

3) Future tense: only Phor. 26, Phormionem nominant, quia
primas partis qui aget, is erit Phormio.

4) Perfect tense:

Historical perfect (35), e.g. Amph. 796, me captas, quia tute
praecucurristi; Aul. 755, quia sum tangere ausus, haud causificor
quin habeam; Bacch. 735, mihi loquitur nec recte quia tibi aurum
reddidi; 804; Capt. 58, ne vereamini quia dixi; Cist. 541, vix ex-
sculpsi ut diceret, quia ei promisi; Epid. 137, male feci, quia amor
mutavit locum; Pers. 756, gratis ago quia sum ultus; Pseud. 280,
hunc pudet quia non dedit; 282; And. 121, quia lamentari visast et
quia erat forma honesta, accedo; Eun. 5, sic existumet responsum

quia laesit prior; 682; Phor. 5, dictitat fabulas tenui esse oratione quia nusquam scripsit; 357; Hec. 681, quia clam te natus est, nactus alteram es; Ad. 566, perquam, quia mulierem vicit; Turp. 35, mi est iratus pater, quia se talento tetigi.

Present perfect (15), e.g. Amph. 811, perii miser quia pudicitiae huius vitium est additum; Capt. 152, huic illud dolet, quia nunc remissus est exercitus; Curc. 225, paves quia non rediit; Men. 128, dona quid cessant mihi conferre quia pugnavi fortiter?   M. G. 1222, quam laeta est quia ted adiit; Poen. 772, quia sciverunt, eum adlegarunt; Phor. 239, incertumst quid agam, quia praeter spem hoc mi obtigit; Hec. 506; Ad. 35, quia non rediit, quibus sollicitor rebus? 596.

5) Pluperfect tense: Rud. 1187, credebam quia evenerat; Eun. 586, quia consimilem luserat ludum, magis animus gaudebat; Hec. 369, continuo voltum earum sensi inmutari, quia tam incommode illis fors obtulerat adventum meum.

b) With correlative *ideo :* Asin. 622, nullum perdidi ideo quia numquam habui; Men. 77, nomen fecit Peniculo mihi, ideo quia mensam detergeo; Merc. 31, hoc ideo fit quia amator profert; 543; Hec. 218, ideo quia, ut domi mihi vos eritis, proinde ego ero fama foris.

c) With correlative *propterea*: As. 385, censebam attigisse propterea quia huc habebas iter; Men. 45, propterea memini, quia vidi; 263, propterea huic urbi nomen Epidamno inditum est, quia nemo sine damno devortitur; M. G. 1257, quia me amat, propterea Venus fecit; 1323; Most. 1155, illum prodire pudet propterea quia fecit; Poen. 62; Turp. 182, mihi videre tuo more aegre id pati, quia hos dies conplusculos intercapedo sumpti faciundi fuit.

d) With correlative *idcirco*:   Merc. 34, hoc idcirco praedico quia nullus amator adeost facundus.

e) *Nisi quia :*   Ad. 523, nulla alia causa odi nisi quia propest.

2. The governing verb is not expressed, but is implied in a question to which the *quia*-clause is the answer (150).

a) In answer to questions with *quid* (60), e.g. Amph. 52, quid contraxistis frontem? quia tragoediam dixi futuram hanc?   Aul. 427, in aedibus quid tibi erat negoti? :: quia venimus coctum ad nuptias; Bacch. 328, quid opust anulo? :: quia id signumst cum Theotimo;

Capt. 174, quid tu id quaeris? :: quia mist natalis dies; Cas. 91, quid me sequere? :: quia certumst mihi; Curc. 135, quid lubet perditum dicere te esse? :: quia id quod amo careo; Merc. 454, quid mea refert? :: quia illi suam rem esse aequomst in manu; Most. 1003, quid res novas requiritas? :: quia hodie adveni; Poen. 637, quid ad me attinet? :: quia venimus; Pseud. 1087, quid non metuam? :: quia numquam abducet; H. T. 801, quid tum? quia videbitur magis veri simile esse; Eun. 88; Phor. 601, quid pertimui? an quia duo sunt mihi dati? 788.

Especially common is *quid ita, quid iam,* e.g. Bacch. 254, quid ita? :: quia scio; 680; Curc. 48; Epid. 58, quid ita? :: quia mittebat; Pers. 592; Eun. 725, quid ita? :: quia iam tum inceperat; Hec. 614; Epid. 407, quid iam? :: quia dixit; 551; M. G. 472, quid iam? :: quia attingere ausu's mulierem; 834; Truc. 133, quid iam? :: quia dixeras.

   b) In answer to questions with *qui* (45), e.g. Amph. 666, qui tibi istuc in mentemst? :: quia sero advenimus; 711; Bacch. 1163, qui non? :: quia flagitiumst; Epid. 33, qui? :: quia ante aliis fuit; 97, qui lubidost male loqui? :: quia te deseris; Merc. 612, qui? :: quia aequalem enicas; Poen. 338, qui lubet? :: quia hodie est mercatus; And. 501, qui incidit suspicio? :: quia te noram; 954; Eun. 121, qui? :: quia neque tu uno eras contenta, neque solus dedit; 745; Phor. 330, qui istuc? :: quia non rete accipitri tennitur.

   Often with appended -*dum,* e.g. Most. 450, quidum? :: sic, quia foris ambulatis; Epid. 299, quidum? :: quia alius illam deperit; Pseud. 337, quidum? :: quia numquam eris; Rud. 1116; Truc. 732, quidum? :: quia plus dedi; Eun. 273, quidum? :: quia tristi's.

   Occasionally the question is indirect: Aul. 563, volo scire qui sit agnus curio. :: quia ossa ac pellis est; Poen. 896, cedo qui credam. :: quia illas emit.

   c) In answer to questions with *cur* (20), e.g. Amph. 687, cur negas? :: quia vera didici dicere; Capt. 715, cur iratus es? :: quia illi fuisti fidelior; 985; Curc. 437, cur non venit? :: quia venimus; Epid. 576, cur? :: quia neque scio neque novi; Merc. 648, cur istuc coeptas consilium? :: quia me adflictat amor; M. G. 1254, cur non pultas? :: quia non est intus; Most. 1098, cur? :: scies; quia id volo; Hec. 322, quor id non dixti? :: quia non poteram.

d) In answer to *quam ob rem* (10), e.g. Amph. 552, quam ob rem? :: quia id mihi praedicas; Capt. 669, quam ob rem suscenses? :: quia me delaceravisti; Curc. 442, quam ob rem? :: quia subegit; Trin. 985; H. T. 437, quam ob rem? :: quia pessume consulis; Eun. 907.

e) In answer to questions with *quapropter* (10), e.g. Asin. 630, quapropter? :: quia hanc amo; Epid. 42, quapropter? :: quia mercatust; Most. 273, quapropter? :: quia recte olet; 825; H. T. 188, quapropter? :: quia incertumst; Hec. 311.

f) In answer to questions with other particles:

1) *Quin:* Merc. 190, quin apstrudebas? quia negotiosi eramus; Pseud. 501, quin (cur non, *codd*) dictumst mihi? : : quia illud malum aderat.

2) *Quo pacto:* Aul. 733, quo pacto esse possum? :: quia istuc facinus ego feci; M. G. 966.

3) *Quae res:* Poen. 318, qua de re? :: quia venimus; 733, qua re? :: quia dicetur; Aul. 423, quae res? :: quia minus quam aequom erat feci.

4) *Qua ratione:* Pseud. 803, qua ratione? :: quia nemo quaerit.

5) *Qua gratia:* Amph. 665, qua gratia? :: quia daturus nemost prandium; Cist. 234; Truc. 288, quanam gratia? : : quia es ausa.

3. Substantive *quia*-clauses (50).

a) In apposition with neuter pronouns. Here the causal notion is usually very slight, *quia* having the force rather of 'that.' Examples: Aul. 418, istuc male factum arbitror quia non latus fodi; Epid. 107, idne pudet te, quia captivam es mercatus? M. G. 1210, istuc acerbumst, quia ero carendumst; Most. 51, invidere mihi hoc videre, quia mihi bene est; Pers. 431, id tibi suscensui quia te negabas; Stich. 34, id doles quia non colunt? Trin. 394, hoc unum consolatur me, quia qui consulit, nugas agit; 1165, quid ego feci? :: meum corrumpi quia perpessus filiam; Truc. 266, quid male dico? :: quia me truculentum nominas; Cato (Jord.), 24, 15, Rhodiensibus id oberit, quia voluisse dicuntur facere? Hec. 255, sin ea (for *id* by attraction) est causa retinendi, quia aegrast.

b) In apposition with nouns: only Pseud. 689, mendacium, quod commentus fui, quia lenonis me esse dixi.

c) As subject of *est:* Asin. 56, quid morbist? :: quia non suppe-

tunt dictis data; Cas. 378, iniquomst quia isti prius quam mihi est; Stich. 506, ut mihi volup est quia vos domum rediisse video.

d) In apposition with neuter pronouns used as ablatives of cause:

1) With *eo:* Amph. 756, eo fit quia mihi credo; Asin. 620, quia oculi sunt lacrumantis, eo rogavi; Bacch. 317, quia clanculum devenit, eo nescio; Capt. 69, nomen indidit Scorto mihi eo, quia invocatus soleo esse; Cist. 492, eo facetus es, quia tibi aliast sponsa; Curc. 61; Pers. 785; 834; Rud. 24, id eo fit quia nihil ei acceptumst; 1114; Stich. 174, Gelasimo nomen mi indidit, quia ridiculus fui, eo quia paupertas fecit ut; Truc. 272; H. T. 505, an eo fit, quia sumus praepediti? 786; Eun. 415, eon es ferox, quia habes? Cato, Agr. 6, 4, convenit eo quia foditur; 17, 1, eo quia semen viride habet, matura est.

2) With *istoc:* Amph. 379, ergo istoc magis, quia vaniloquos, vapulabis.

3) With *hoc:* Amph. 254, hoc adeo hoc commemini, quia impransus fui; Rud. 388, hoc sese excruciat quia leno ademit cistulam.

e) In apposition with *ob eam rem:* Epid. 596, ob eam rem emisti, quia ratus es? Men. 1055; Trin. 324, ob eam rem haec autumavi, quia res quaedam est; Ad. 989, ob eam rem quia non obsequor.

f) *Nisi quia:* Pers. 545, iuxta tecum aeque scio, nisi quia specie liberalist; Pseud. 106, id futurum unde dicam nescio, nisi quia futurumst; 567, quo id sim facturus pacto nihil etiam scio, nisi quia futurumst; Rud. 1024, neque scio, nisi quia hunc meum esse dico; Truc. 785, incertus sum, nisi quia timeo; Eun. 736, nescibam id dicere illam, nisi quia correxit miles; Cist. 223, neque, nisi quia non eo pessum, mihi ulla abest permities. Except in the last of these examples the *quia*-clause is the object of a *scio* to be supplied in thought after *nisi; cf.* Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Conjunctionen *quod* u. *quia*, p. 23. Not strictly an object clause, though obviously modelled on the foregoing, is Trin. 936, sed ego sum insipientior, qui egomet unde redeam hunc rogitem, quae ego sciam atque hic nesciat; nisi quia lubet experiri quo evasurust.

In the following instances *nisi* alone seems to be used in the sense of *nisi quia:* Cist. 676, ubi sit nescio, nisi loca haec circiter mi excidit; 4, qui magis potueris, nescio, nisi non arbitror; Bacch. 324,

nil scio nisi nescio; Epid. 281, quid ego (sc. dicam), nisi te commen-
tum astute intellego? Poen. 649, nescimus; nisi ut processimus,
atque videmus; Rud. 750, nescio, nisi scio probiorem hanc esse;
Eun. 735, nil dixit? :: nil, nisi abiens mi innuit; 826, nescio; nisi
amasse credo Pamphilam.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUONIAM.*

1. Present tense (20).

a) Referring to present time (10), e.g. Amph. 396, quid tibi lubet
fac, quoniam plus vales; 835; M. G. 840, quoniam non licet, invides;
Pseud. 7, quoniam non potest, necessitas me subigit; Rud. 1122,
nunc demum istuc dicis, quoniam ius meum esse intellegis; Trin.
989, quoniam advenis, — vapulabis; And. 250, ea quoniam nemini
obtrudi potest, itur ad me; 305.

b) Historical present (10), e.g. Capt. 490, redeo, quoniam video;
Cist. 164, quoniam nescit, servom participat consili; Poen. 455,
quoniam litare nequeo, abii; Stich. 556; Trin. 14, quoniam video,
dedi ei meam gnatam.

2. Perfect tense (20).

a) Present perfect (13), e.g. Amph. 266, quoniam formam huius
cepi, decet mores habere me similis; Asin. 711, quid nunc? quoniam
nos delusistis; Capt. 930; Men. 1151, quoniam haec evenere, redea-
mus; Most. 63 pergite, quoniam occepistis; And. 595, te oro, quoniam
mi effecisti has nuptias; Eun. 237; Afran. 354, quoniam nuptiae
sunt dictae, parcas istis verbis.

b) Historical perfect (7), e.g. Amph. 586, quoniam neglexisti,
nunc venis; Asin. 152, hic loquar, quoniam intus non licitumst; 847;
Acc. 120, ad populum intellego referendum, quoniam aequiter sen-
tentiae fuere.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUANDO.*[1]

1. Present tense, referring to present time (60), e.g. Amph. 390, non
loquar, quando plus vales; 440; Cas. 497, quid opus est, quando
domi est? Cist. 532, quando non licet, perdam operam; Curc. 216,
migrare certumst, quando sentio; 662; 708; Men. 153, age sane
igitur, quando aequom oras; Merc. 472, me morti dabo, quando id

[1] Scherer, De particulae *quando* apud vetustissimos Scriptores Latinos vi et usu,
Studemund, Studien, ii, p. 88 ff.

adimitur; M. G. 1227, patiar quando Venus volt; Poen. 447; 1389; Stich. 483; And. 805, ut quimus, quando ut volumus non licet; Eun. 447; Phor. 999, quando nil times, narra; 1034; Hec. 477, quando deputat, segreganda aut mater est aut Philumena; 512; Ad. 348; 437; 802; Stat. 176, patiere quod dant, quando optata non danunt; 177.

2. Future tense: only Hec. 618, tua re fert nili, quando haec aberit.

3. Perfect tense (25).

a) Present perfect (20), e.g. Capt. 300, quando libertatem perdidi, non censeo; Curc. 527, quando bene gessi rem, volo hic supplicare; M. G. 1085, quin abis, quando responsumst; Poen. 815; Stich. 518, quando ita rem gessistis, pax est; And. 818, duc me ad eam, quando huc veni; Phor. 894, dis magnas merito gratias habeo, quando evenere haec; Ad. 201; 287; 435; Pacuv. 131, ne illum exspectes quando fecisti; Lucil. 145, docebo, quando mansi; 768.

b) Historical perfect (5), e.g. Amph. 891, faciundum est mi quod illaec postulat, quando id Amphitruoni offuit; Bacch. 445; Ad. 296.

4. Pluperfect tense: only Stich. 559, aequom postulabat senex, quando dederat dotem.

5. *Quandoquidem* (15), e.g. Men. 1024, verum, quandoquidem te servavi; Merc. 171, obsecro, quandoquidem supplicandum video; 180; 618; Truc. 559, quandoquidem perditum se it, eum adiutabo; And. 487, deos quaeso ut sit superstes, quandoquidem ipsest ingenio bono; 608; H. T. 1064, quandoquidem ducendast, habeo; Phor. 403, magistratus adi quandoquidem solus regnas; Hec. 492; Ad. 640; Turp. 127, etiam amplius illam apparare condecet quandoquidem voti condemnata est.

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOM.*

Quom causal is a natural outgrowth of *quom* temporal. A typical illustration of the origin is seen in Hec. 385, quom orata huius reminiscor, nequeo quin lacrumem, where the meaning partakes both of the temporal and causal forces. There are many such passages, in which it is impossible to determine whether the relation is primarily temporal or causal. The usage is particularly frequent with verbs of emotion (joy, suffering, fear, etc.), verbs of commending, congratulating, thanking, and the like.

1. **With expressions of rejoicing (15),** e.g. Amph. 681, quom gravidam te aspicio, gaudeo; Cas. 417, quom nos di iuvere, gaudeo; Epid. 711, quom tu es liber, gaudeo; so Men. 1031; 1148; Most. 1128, salvos quom advenis, gaudeo; Truc. 384; Lucil. 709, gaudes, quom de me ista foris sermonibus differs; Turp. 191, quom te salvom video, gliscor gaudio; M. G. 1211, volup est quom evenit; so also Poen. 1326; Rud. 1176; Poen. 1412, quom invenisti, mihi voluptatist; so Rud. 1183; Afran. 183, quom veni, iuvat.

2. **With expressions of fear or pain (15),** e.g. Pseud. 1114, metuo, quom non adest; 1214, metuo quom verba audio; Hec. 734, timida sum quom venit in mentem; Trin. 289, lacrumas haec quom video eliciunt; Hec. 405, lacrumo quom in mentem venit; Most. 149, cor dolet quom scio; Poen. 842, haec quom video fieri, crucior; so Trin. 1170; 103, quom audio, excrucior; Cist. 77, maceror quom illum exoptavi; Capt. 995, eheu! quom plus minusque feci; so also with interjections of suffering: Men. 303, ei mihi quom nihil est; M. G. 1358; And. 622, ei mihi, quom non habeo spatium.

3. **With expressions of praising:** Capt. 151, laudo quom amici tuom ducis malum; Naev. Com. 3, laudes ago, quom votis me multat meis.

4. **With expressions of thanking (25),** e.g. Asin. 545, laudes gratiasque habemus magnas, quom —; Capt. 373, gratiam habeo tibi, quom copiam mi facis; 922, Iovi ago gratias, quom te redducem reddiderunt; Curc. 699, Aesculapio habeto, quom pudica es, gratiam; Merc. 843; Most. 432; Poen. 257, ecquid gratiae quom te evocavi? 1255; Trin. 505; 821; And. 770, dis pol habeo gratiam, quom adfuerunt liberae; Ad. 138, et est dis gratia quom ita est; Capt. 215, obnoxii vobis sumus, quom facitis nos compotes; M. G. 1419, di tibi bene faciant, quom advocatus mihi bene's; Poen. 208, tibi di dent bona, quom optulisti; similarly Poen. 667; 687; Vid. 86; Ad. 917, di tibi bene faciant, quom video; Capt. 355, di tibi omnia optata offerant, quom me tanto honore honestas.

5. **With expressions of congratulating:** Rud. 1178, quom evenit, gratulor; 1270, gratulabor, quom illam invenit? Truc. 516, quom tu recte provenisti quomque es aucta liberis, gratulor, quom peperisti decus; Afran. 20, quom salvos venis, gratulor dis.

6. **With other expressions (50).**

a) Present tense:

Asin. 515, queror fortunas, quom prohibeor; Bacch. 536, salvos quom advenis, cena detur; similarly Curc. 561; Truc. 127; 359; Capt. 280, quom tanta gratiast, quid divitiae? 371; M. G. 1044, magnum me faciam, quom me conlaudat; Most. 29, illum corruptum duco, quom his factis studet; Pseud. 476, merito esse iratum arbitror, quom apud te parvast ei fides; Stich. 81: Trin. 900, quom hic nugatur, contra nugari lubet; H. T. 842, me fortunatissumum factum puto esse, quom intellego; Phor. 538, quin, quom opust, experiemur? Hec. 482; Ad. 18, eam laudem hic ducit maxumam, quom illis placet qui vobis placent; Enn. Trag. 1, defende quom potes defendere; Pacuv. 206, esse adiutam expetunt quom danunt; Lucil. 122, cenasti numquam bene, quom omnia in ista consumis squilla.

Sometimes the *quom*-clause gives the reason for making a statement or asking a question, and not the reason for the contents of the statement or question, e. g. Amph. 753, quaeso, num tu insanis, quom id me interrogas? Poen. 914, lepidus quom mones; Pseud. 293, quom pietatem te amori video praevortere, omnes tibi patres sunt? Ad. 897, bonus es quom existumas.

b) Future tense: only Phor. 132, quom tu nil refelles, vincam.

c) Perfect tense (15), e.g. Asin. 82, quom me adiit, cupio; Capt. 411, fecisti ut redire liceat, quom confessus es; Curc. 105; Poen. 1077, iterum gnatus videor, quom te repperi; 1137; Pseud. 906; Rud. 1206, ut rem divinam faciam Laribus, quom auxerunt nostram familiam; And. 488; H. T. 381, laudo et fortunatam iudico, id quom studuisti; Hec. 230; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi, clam tendenda est plaga; Licin. Imbrex, 1.

Praesertim quom occurs Asin. 80, praesertim quom me dignum habuit, me habere honorem decet.

7. Substantive clauses introduced by *Quom* Causal: Amph. 641a, hoc me beat quom perduellis vicit; Bacch. 337, istuc sapienter fecit, quom diviti homini id aurum servandum dedit; H. T. 298, magnum hoc quoque signumst, quom neceleguntur internuntii; Pseud. 822, hoc brevem vitam colunt, quom hasce herbas in alvom congerunt; Rud. 1234, isto tu pauper es quom piu's; Truc. 152, istoc tu otiosus es, quom pervorsus es; Phor. 966, hoc fretus, quom e medio excessit (= mortua est).

CAUSAL CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUATENUS.*

Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, 12, quatenus id fieri non potest (the genuineness of the fragment is disputed by Eduard Meyer and others); Scipio Afr. (Meyer), p. 214, quatenus castra nostra ita munita erant.

CAUSAL CLAUSES OF THE TYPE: *QUID EST QUOD?* 'WHAT IS THE
REASON WHY?'

The way in which *quod* in expressions of the above type developed its peculiar force is not perfectly clear. Possibly a starting-point was found in expressions like Men. 677, scin quid est quod ad te venio? Stich. 107, quid est istuc quod venis? 127, hoc est quod ad vos venio. In these the *quod* is originally an accusative of the inner object, — 'Do you know what it is on which I am coming to you?' 'What is that errand on which you are coming?' 'This is the errand on which I am coming to you.' But this meaning easily passes into that of 'What reason is there why?' 'This is the reason why.' Assuming that the idiom in question established itself in the way suggested, it would then be easy for its application to be extended to expressions like: Epid. 609, quid est quod illi caperrat frons, and others noted below. We recognize several different forms of these clauses:

1. **Type** *quid est quod?:* Epid. 609; 570, quid est quod me excivisti? Cas. 630, quid est quod haec huc exsiluit? Merc. 175, quin tu expedis quid siet quod me quaerebas? Most. 69, quid est quod me nunc obtuere? Pseud. 9, quid est quod gestas tabellas? H. T. 613, quid est quod crepuerunt fores? Eun. 558, quid est quod sic gestis? 559, quid est quod laetus es? 978, quid est quod trepidas? Ad. 305, quidnam est quod sic video timidum Getam?

2. **Type** *quid hoc est quod?:* Cist. 655, quid hoc est quod cistella hic iacet? Most. 1062, quid hoc est quod foris concrepuit? Eun. 642, sed quid hoc quod subito egreditur? Merc. 368, sed istuc quid est tibi quod commutatust color? Men. 958, quid illuc est quod med insanire praedicant? Merc. 120, quid illuc est quod ille tam expedite exquirit cursuram? Acc. 299, quid istuc est quod me a tecto excies?

3. **Type** *quid hoc negotist quod:* Bacch. 415, quid hoc negotist

Lydus quod erum ciet? Cist. 774, quid hoc negotist quod omnes homines fabulantur per vias mihi esse filiam inventam? Men. 762, quidnam hoc sit negoti quod filia repente expetit me? Rud. 559, quid illuc negoti quod duae mulierculae signum tenent?

4. Type *hoc est quod*: Cas. 531, hoc erat quod vir tanto opere orabat meus; Men. 1135, hoc erat quod haec te meretrix huius vocabat nomine; Merc. 711, hoc est ire quod rus meus vir noluit; Acc. 96, hocinest quod tam temeriter tu meam benevolentiam interisse es ratus? Rud. 1258, illuc est quod nos nequam servis utimur; Hec. 273, nam est quod me transire oportet.

RELATIVE CAUSAL CLAUSES.

Attention is called below (p. 292 ff.) to certain classes of descriptive clauses in the subjunctive which have an accessory notion of cause. Many clauses of the same logical value and of the same form (barring the mood) stand in the indicative. In connection with descriptive causal clauses in the subjunctive we shall note that the antecedent of the relative is more commonly in the first or second persons, and that the causal clause often denotes the reason for the speaker's making a statement or asking a question. The same is true in case of those indicative clauses now to be considered.

1. Antecedent in first person, e.g. Amph. 325, infelix fui, qui non alas intervelli; Men. 852, sumne ego mulier misera quae illaec audio? Merc. 588, sumne ego miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere? Pers. 75, sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam? 474, sumne probus, qui civitatem auxi? Rud. 1184, sumne ego scelestus, qui excepi? And. 646, me miserum, qui tuom animum ex animo spectavi meo. With these cf. such passages as Men. 443, inscitus qui postulem; Merc. 701, miserior me quae nupserim; 920, ego stultior qui credam, in which the subjunctive is used. Other examples of the indicative are: Asin. 300, ego, qui ted expendi, scio; 617, scio, qui periclum feci; Aul. 796, qur eiulas, quem avom feci? Merc. 151, opera licet experiri, qui me rupi caussa tua; M. G. 1376, stulte feci, qui hunc amisi; Most. 301, egone id exprobrem, qui mihimet cupio id opprobrarier! 776, quid mihi fiet, qui solus facio? Rud. 274, nunc amplectimur genua, quae in locis nesciis sumus; 516, est quod habeas gratiam mihi, qui te ex insulso salsum feci;

640; 994, ego, qui sum piscator, scio; Eun. 292, neque virgost usquam neque ego, qui illam a conspectu amisi meo; 1004, mihi solae ridiculo fuit, quae quid timeret scibam.

2. **Antecedent in the second person**: Asin. 227, tua ista culpast, quae amoves; Cas. 645, excetra tu, ludibrio me quae habuisti; Cist. 291, utrum deliras, qui me iubes? Men. 292, insanum esse te scio, qui mihi molestus es; 299, ubi ego te noverim, qui amicam habes eram meam? Merc. 177, credo, instes acriter, qui nunc flagitas; 873, male facis, properantem qui me commorare; Most. 251, quid opust speculo tibi, quae tute speculo speculum es? 438, peccavisti largiter, qui occasionem hanc amisisti; 1014, quid somnias? :: egone? :: at quidem tu, qui speras; 1142; Pers. 747; Poen. 852, haud amice facis, qui offers moram; Pseud. 378, frustra es, qui postulas; Rud. 1166, te di perdant, qui me hodie vidisti; H. T. 589, di te eradicent, qui me hinc extrudis; Phor. 156, rogitas, qui tam audacis facinoris mihi consciu's? Turp. 117, sanusne es, qui temere lamentare?

3. **Antecedent in the third person**: Bacch. 455, fortunatum Nicobulum, qui illum produxit sibi; 485, illum perisse dico, quoi periit pudor; 1134; Cas. 552, flagitium hominis, qui dixit; 657, imitatur malam disciplinam, viro quae suo interminatur; Men. 309, insanit hicquidem, qui male dicit sibi; cf. 312, tu quidem non sanus, qui male dicas tibi, where the subjunctive is used; M. G. 1081, quot ipse annos vivet, quoius filii tam diu vivont? Stich. 340, at ego perii, quoi medullam lassitudo perbibit; 341; 561; Truc. 413, tu te pro puerpera hic procuras? :: quippini, ubi sine labore res geri pulchre potest?

4. *Quippe qui* occurs in the following instances: Amph. 21, quod dictum foret, scibat facturos, quippe qui intellexerat; 745; Epid. 618, quippe ego quoi libertas in mundo sitast; Pseud. 1274, ad hunc me modum intuli illis satis facete ex discipulina, quippe ego qui probe Ionica perdidici; Rud. 384. *Quippe quo* is read by most recent editors (following Lambinus) in Bacch. 368, ianuam hanc Orci, quippe quo (qui, cui, *codd*) nemo advenit, nisi quem spes reliquere.

ADVERSATIVE CLAUSES IN THE INDICATIVE.[1]

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *etsi, tam etsi, etiam si, tamen si, tamen etsi*.

1. Introduced by *etsi* (40): Bacch. 1191, etsi est dedecori, patiar; Capt. 543, sum servus, etsi domi liber fui; 742, etsi pervivo, tamen breve spatiumst perferundi; 744; 842; Cas. 957, vapulo invitus, etsi merui; M. G. 407, non vidi, etsi vidi; 532, etsi east, non est ea; Most. 609a, etsi procul abest, urit male; 854; Pers. 272, mane etsi properas; 655, etsi res sunt fractae, amici sunt tamen; Poen. 1084, facito reddas, etsi hic habitabit; Pseud. 1113, etsi abest, arbitror; Rud. 1044, etsi ignotust, notus (est); 1350; Trin. 383, etsi advorsatus tibi fui, istac iudico; 527; 600; And. 374, ibo, etsi me spes haec frustratast; 348; H. T. 119, ambo accusandi; etsi illud inceptum animist pudentis signum; 225; 327; 624; Eun. 968, dicam etsi scio; Phor. 407, etsi mihi facta iniuriast, verum tamen abduc hanc, minas v accipe; Hec. 243, etsi scio, tamen faciam; 258; 404; 505; 578; 788; 834; Ad. 944, etsi absurdum videtur, fiat; Enn. Trag. 165, etsi dices, facile flexeris; Pacuv. 206, etsi perdunt, tamen expetunt; Acc. 234, etsi sunt datae fruges, tamen enitent; 616; Titin. 119, etsi tacebit, tamen gaudebit.

2. Introduced by *tam etsi* (*tametsi*) (21): Amph. 21, me misit, tam etsi scibat; 977, audis quae dico, tam etsi praesens non ades; Aul. 768, tam etsi fur es, molestus non ero; Capt. 321, ne, tam etsi unicus sum, videatur; Curc. 259, tam etsi non novi, dabo; 504; Men. 92, numquam fugiet, tam etsi capital fecerit; M. G. 744, tam etsi dominus non invitus patitur, servi murmurant; Pers. 362, tam etsi id futurum non est, quanta adficitur miseria; Poen. 342, proba mers facile emptorem reperit, tam etsi in apstruso sitast; 1201; Pseud. 244, tam etsi occupata's, moramur; 471; Stich. 41, tam etsi es maior, moneo ut memineris; Stich. 205, tam etsi haud indignos iudico, nil moror; And. 348, obtundis, tam etsi intellego? Eun. 316, tam etsi bonast natura, reddunt iunceam; Phor. 428, metuit, tam etsi dissimulat; Lucil. 145, tam etsi non quaeris, docebo; 652, auxilium, tam etsi est indignus, feram.

3. Introduced by *etiam si*: Cas. 93, etiam si in crucem vis pergere,

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 54 ff.

sequi decretumst; Epid. 518, etiam si alterum tantum perdundumst, perdam potius quam sinam; Hec. 648, etiam si dudum fuerat ambiguom, nunc non est.

4. Introduced by *tamen etsi*: M. G. 1209, tamen etsi istuc mihi acerbumst, saltem id volup est; Most. 1167, verberibus caedere. : : tamen etsi pudet? Enn. Ann. 344, tamen etsi res bene gesta est, corde suo trepidat; And. 864, te commotum reddam. : : tamen etsi hoc verum est?

5. Introduced by *tamen si*: Cas. 795, tamen hercle si esurit, nullum esurit.

6. For adversative ("concessive") clauses introduced by *si*, see under "Conditional Sentences," p. 78 ff.

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *quamquam*.

1. Without correlative particle in the main clause: Asin. 710, asta ut descendam, quamquam nequam es; 831; Aul. 359, quamquam Volcano studes, cenaene causa nos nostras aedis postulas comburere? 679, inde observabo, quamquam hic manere me iusserat; Bacch. 1171a, quamquam tu bella es, malum tibi dabo; Cas. 263; 727, mane quamquam fastidis; Cist. 106, quamquam erit molestum, faciam; 307; Men. 1048, ibo intro ad hanc, quamquam suscenset mihi; Merc. 287, quamquam negotiumst, non sum occupatus; 800, quamquam tu irata es, iubeas; M. G. 758, numquam dicunt, quamquam adpositumst ampliter; 1231; 1319; Pers. 337, quamquam studes, filiam vendas tuam? 615; Poen. 515; 621, te salutamus, quamquam hanc salutem ferimus inviti et quamquam bene volumus; 638; 858; 1407; Pseud. 372; 786; 1049, quamquam nequam homo's, recte mones; Rud. 1041, quamquam istuc esse ius meum certo scio, fiat istuc; 1043; Trin. 842, quamquam domi cupio, opperiar; 1112; 1184; Truc. 317; 780; 910; 922; 923; Ad. 159, quamquamst scelestus, non committet; 205, possum ferre, quamquam iniuriumst; Pacuv. 259, quamquam graviter cernimus ictum, nimis paene animo es molli; 304, quamquam aetas senet, satis habeam virium; Acc. 56, quamquam exanguest corpus mi; Stat. 21, quamquam advenio, ne reare; Enn. Ann. 28, 15, nec se dedit, quamquam manus tendebam; Afran. 10, quamquam non exercetur, delaborat.

2. With correlative particle (*tamen, verum tamen, at, tam*) in main

clause: Asin. 497, quamquam sum sordidatus, frugi tamen sum;
Cas. 421, quamquam hoc tibi aegre est, tamen fac accures; Cist. 633,
quamquam te carebo, animum ego inducam tamen; M. G. 1354, quam-
quam fideliores habuisti, tamen tibi habeo magnam gratiam; Pers. 170,
quamquam vinum bibo, at mandata non consuevi bibere una; 344,
verum tamen, quamquam res nostrae sunt pauperculae, modeste
meliust vitam vivere; Poen. 196, quamquam Cupido in corde vorsa-
tur, tamen auscultabo; 536, tamen, quamquam sumus pauperculi,
est domi quod edimus; Stich. 722, quamquam gravatus fuisti, non
nocuit tamen; Trin. 259, quamquam illud est dulce, Amor amara dat
tamen; H. T. 53, quamquam haec nuper notitia est nec quicquam
fuit, tamen virtus tua facit; Eun. 172, quamquam cupio atque arbi-
tror, tamen faciam; Titin. 157, quamquam estis nihili, tam (= *tamen*)
ecastor simul vobis consului; Afran. 124, quamquam non tam calleo,
tamen fefelli; Cato (Jord.), 33, 4, quamquam fecere, tamen nequeo
desinere.

3. A few instances of corrective *quamquam* also occur: Asin. 78,
quamquam illum mater arte habet; Aul. 123, quamquam haud falsa
sum nos odiosas haberi; Capt. 272, quamquam non multum fuit
molesta servitus; Amph. 491; Trin. 787.

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *quom.*

1. Without correlative particle in the main clause: Amph. 828, quom
de illo Sosia mirumst, certe de istoc Amphitruone iam alterum
mirumst magis; Bacch. 1004, sat sic suspectus sum quom careo
noxia; 1138a, ne balant quidem, quom a pecu cetero absunt; Capt.
244; 423; Men. 843, insanire me aiunt, ultro quom ipsi insaniunt;
Most. 168, quid te exornas, quom lepida tute es? Poen. 235, quom
munditer nos habemus, vix amatorculos invenimus; Pseud. 1030,
quom haec metuo, metuo ne advenat; Stich. 34, quia officium non
colunt, quom tu tuom facis; Truc. 191, palam quom mentiuntur,
verum esse credimus; 888, quom multum apstulimus, haud multum
apparet; Phor. 22, finem faciam dicundi, peccandi quom ipse finem
non facit.

2. With correlative particle (*tamen, tum, tam*) in the main clause:
Cist. 1, quom te amavi et crevi, tum id hodie aperuisti; Most. 858,
servi, qui quom culpa carent, tamen malum metuont; Rud. 382,

qui it lavatum, quom vestimenta servat, tamen surripiuntur; Stich.
745, quom lautast, infectast tamen; Truc. 704, quom hoc volup est,
tum illuc magnae mellinae mihi; And. 96, quom id mihi placebat,
tum uno ore omnes omnia bona dicere; Eun. 243, nil quom est, nil
defit tamen; Phor. 187, quom mihi paveo, tum Antipho me excruciat
animi; Titin. 156, bene quom facimus, tam (= *tamen*) male subimus.

Indicative Adversative Clauses Introduced by Relative Pronouns.

Instances of this type are exceedingly rare. I have noted only
Amph. 134, illa illum censet virum esse, quae cum moechost; 561,
audes praedicare domi te esse, qui ades ?

Adversative Clauses Introduced by *utut (ut ut).*

The main clause of such periods often contains a correlative *tamen.*

Examples: Amph. 397, utut es facturus, hoc quidem haud reticebo;
1100, gaudeo, utut me erga meritast; Bacch. 403, utut eris, haud
celabis; 1191, id utut est, patiar; Cist. 109, utut est meritust, in
cordi est tamen; Merc. 558, utut est, non ibo tamen; Most. 545, utut
res sese habet, pergam turbare porro; Poen. 833, qui habet quod det,
utut homo est, omnia genera recipiuntur; Pseud. 310, utut est, mihi
mortuos est; H. T. 200, utut erat, mansum oportuit; Phor. 468,
utut erant alia, illi certe consuleres; 531; Ad. 248, utut haec sunt
acta, meum mihi reddatur; 629, non me hanc rem patri, utut erat
gesta, indicasse.

INDICATIVE CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY LOCAL PARTICLES.

The local particles *ubi, qua, quo, unde,* used in a relative function,
occur very frequently in indicative clauses in Early Latin. They
present no features of importance, however, and a few citations under
each will suffice.

1. Clauses introduced by *ubi:* Bacch. 1107, ibi sum esse ubi mise-
rum hominem decet; Capt. 323, illi ubi minime honestumst; 508, ad
fratrem abii, ubi sunt captivi; Cist. 211, ubi sum, ibi non sum; ubi
non sum, ibi est animus; Cist. 319; Men. 10; Eun. 537, ut transeas
ubi est; Hec. 217, illi ubi sum; Cato, Agr. 84, videto ut percocas ubi
altissimum est; Enn. Trag. 203; Acc. 154.

Ubi ubi: Cas. 722, ubi ubi sunt, damno dominos multant; Epid.

492, illam requiram ubi ubi est; M. G. 399; Rud. 1210; And. 684; Eun. 295.

Ubi is freely used where we should normally find a relative pronoun with a preposition: e.g. Epid. 219, cum illa ubi rem properat perdere; Pseud. 771, servitus ubi praefulcior; Rud. 1110, ⟨vidulum⟩ ubi sunt signa; Cato, Agr. 14, 5.

Sicubi is found: Eun. 403, sicubi eum satietas aut negoti si quando odium ceperat. . . . nostin? Cato, Agr. 6, 3, sicubi locus umectus erit, ibi serito; 32, 2, sicubi opus erit, de arbore deiciantur; 155, 2, in fossis, sicubi aqua constat.

Ubiquomque occurs As. 110, ubi eris? : : ubi quomque lubitum erit animo meo; Cas. 226, ubiquomque est lepidum unguentum, unguor.

Utrubi is found Stich. 750, utrubi tu vis.

2. Clauses introduced by *qua*, e.g. Aul. 647, tempta qua lubet; Men. 237, omnis oras qua adgreditur mare sumus circumvecti; Truc. 304; Cato, Agr. 1, 3, prope amnis qua naves ambulant; Naev. Trag. 19.

Quaqua is found M. G. 92, deridiculost quaqua incedit.

3. Clauses introduced by *quo*, e.g. Aul. 657, abi quo lubet; Capt. 370, huc vel illuc vortar, quo imperabitis; Men. 516, non tu abis quo dignus es? 1029; Merc. 649; H. T. 813, ibin quo dignus es? Eun. 124, sine me pervenire quo volo; Phor. 641; 893; Cato, Agr. 106, ex alto sumito, quo aqua dulcis non accedit; 112, 1.

Equivalent to a relative pronoun with a preposition: Pers. 201, eius quo sum missus; Trin. 400, aperiuntur aedes quo ibam; Cato, Agr. 101, vas quo condideris, oblinito.

Quoquo: Merc. 857, certa rest me usque quaerere illam quoquo abductast; Pseud. 858, quoquo spectabit, spectato; Phor. 551, quoquo asportabitur, certumst persequi.

4. Clauses introduced by *unde*: Cist. 62, indidem unde oritur, facito ut facias stultitiam sepelibilem; Men. 56, illuc redeo unde abii; Merc. 511, illim unde huc advecta sum; Rud. 412, petam hinc aquam unde mi imperavit; Truc. 131, oles, unde es, disciplinam; Phor. 604, petam hinc unde institi.

Unde equivalent to a relative pronoun with a preposition: Most. 547, conveni illum unde hasce aedis emeram; 997, eccum unde aedis filius emit; Pers. 559, haec unde aberunt, ea urbs moenita sat erit; Rud. 690, signum unde abreptae (sc. sumus); Phor. 748, cum hac

familia unde exis ; 967, quom e medio excessit, unde haec susceptast; 1017, mulierculam eam compressit unde haec natast; Ad. 302, tot res circumvallant se unde emergi non potest; Cato, Agr. 58, oleas, unde minimum olei fieri poterit; Enn. Trag. 2, subices umidas unde oritur.

CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOTIENS*.

Examples: Epid. 175, quotiens vides, sacruficas; Men. 114, quotiens foras ire volo, me retines; Truc. 195, horresco, mentio quotiens fit partionis; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quotiens ibis, totiens magis placebit; 59, quotiens dabis, accipito; 151, 4, quotiens opus erit, purges; Jord. 62, 1.

Quotiensquomque occurs Capt. 97, quotiensquomque conspicio, fleo; Truc. 282; Cato, Agr. 151, 4.

CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOAD*.

Quoad occurs twice only with the indicative in Early Latin, viz.: Asin. 296, iubeo te salvere voce summa, quoad vires valent; Men. 769, verum est modus tamen quoad pati uxorem oportet.   In the first of these passages *quoad* has the signification 'as far as'; in the second it is equivalent to *ad quem.*

CHAPTER IV.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN PRINCIPAL CLAUSES.

ORIGINAL FORCE OF THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE.[1]

The Greek name for mood was ἔγκλισις, literally 'inclination,' or
'turn,' i.e. 'turn of thought.' Sometimes also we find the designa-
tion διάθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς or διάθεσις ψυχική, 'mental attitude,' or 'condi-
tion.' The Romans regularly employed the designation *modus* for
the conception of mood. Yet traces of the influence of the Greek
designation are still to be seen in definitions given by Roman gram-
marians. Thus Priscian, Keil, Gr. Lat. ii, p. 421, 17, defines *modi*
as *diversae inclinationes animi, varios eius affectiones demonstrantes*, a
definition which embraces both the conception in ἔγκλισις and that
in διάθεσις τῆς ψυχῆς. Diomedes, Keil, Gr. Lat. i, p. 338, gives the
heading : *De modis sive inclinationibus*, indicating that *inclinatio* was
sometimes used as an alternative designation with *modus*.

The Greeks recognized five ἐγκλίσεις, viz. ὁριστική (Indicative),

---

[1] Of the extensive literature on this subject, the following is the most important :
Delbrück, Gebrauch des Conjunktivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen,
1871, p. 11 ff.; Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax, 1879, p. 115 ff.; Altindische Syn-
tax, 1888, p. 302 ff.; Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, ii, p. 349 ff.;
365 ff.; Brugmann, Griechische Grammatik [3], p. 498 ff.; Kurze Vergleichende Gram-
matik, p. 578 ff.; Blase, Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache, iii, 1, p. 112
ff.; Bergaigne, De coniunctivi et optativi in Indo-Europaeis linguis informatione et
vi antiquissima, 1877, p. 41–50; 57–73; Hale, Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and
Latin, 1894, p. 6 ff.; A Century of Metaphysical Syntax, Congress of Arts and Sci-
ences, Universal Exposition, 1904, iii, p. 191 ff.; Dräger, Historische Syntax der latei-
nischen Sprache, i, p. 304 ff.; Kühner, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen
Sprache, ii, p. 130; Schmalz, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik [4], p. 328 ff.; Morris,
The Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii,
p. 133 ff.; 275 ff.; 383 ff.; On Principles and Methods in Syntax, Chaps. iii, iv (cf.
the criticism by Delbrück, in Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, 1902,
p. 333 ff.) ; Lattmann, De coniunctivo latino, 1896; Bedeutung der Modi, Neue Jahr-
bücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, 1903, p. 410 ff.; Goodwin, Greek Moods and
Tenses, p. 371 ff.; Mutzbauer, Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwickelung im
Griechischen, 1908, p. 4 ff.; 143 ff.; Kruczkiewickz, Zeitschrift für österreichische
Gymnasien, 1894, p. 694 ff.; Stahl, Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Ver-
bums, 1907, p. 220 ff.; Bréal, Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique, xi, p. 273 ff.;
Sonnenschein, Unity of the Latin Subjunctive, 1910, appeared as this chapter was
going through the press.

προστακτική (Imperative), εὐκτική (Optative), ὑποτακτική (Subjunctive), ἀπαρέμφατος (Infinitive).

Two of these Greek designations are of importance here, viz. εὐκτική and ὑποτακτική. The name εὐκτική was good for only a small portion of the uses of the Greek optative, viz. its employment in wishes. It did not apply with accuracy to the potential uses of the mood. The Romans, having no special verbal forms recognized as optative, had no need of the designation *modus optativus.* Yet they sometimes used it, *ad imitationem Graecorum,* as Priscian remarks (Keil, Gr. Lat. ii, p. 407). But it should be noted that the Romans never used the name *optativus* to designate a group of inflected forms. With them it designated merely a syntactical use of the subjunctive, viz. the subjunctive in wishes. They thus made the name narrower than the Greek εὐκτική, whose syntactical province extended beyond what its title designated.

Ἔγκλισις ὑποτακτική meant 'mood of subordination,' and was the Greek designation for what we ordinarily call the subjunctive. But the name was a poor one, since it applied only to the uses of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses, and implied that these represented the original function of the mood. It ignored the independent volitive uses (hortatory, jussive, deliberative, prohibitive), also the pure future uses.

The Romans translated ὑποτακτική by *subiunctivus ;* less frequently by *coniunctivus,* designations quite as misleading, of course, as the Greek original from which they were taken.

The Latin subjunctive, as is well recognized, is the result of a fusion of two original moods of the Indo-European parent-speech, the subjunctive and optative. Greek and Sanskrit kept these distinct from each other, but in Latin they early became merged in a single mood endowed with the characteristic meanings of each. The following table indicates the origin of the different formations appearing in the so-called Latin subjunctive:

SUBJUNCTIVE FORMS.	OPTATIVE FORMS.
1. All regular presents, e.g. *amem, moneam, regam, audiam.*	1. Presents in *-im,* e.g. *sim, possim, nolim, malim, velim, edim, duim.*
2. All imperfects, e.g. *amarem, monerem, essem,* etc.	2. All perfects, e.g. *viderim, amaverim,* etc.
3. All pluperfects, e.g. *amavissem, dixissem,* etc.	

It has been stated above that the Latin subjunctive, as containing both subjunctive and optative forms inherited from the Indo-European parent-speech, possessed the characteristic meanings of both moods. Yet for more than a century there have existed wide differences of opinion as to the fundamental values of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative, and even to-day final judgment cannot be said to have been reached. Certain scholars, in fact, deny that either of these moods in Indo-European possessed any fairly definite basal meaning. I shall content myself with giving a brief outline of the history of opinion on this topic, with an indication of the reasons which have determined my own conclusions.

For nearly seventy years after the beginning of the nineteenth century the dominant conceptions concerning the moods were almost exclusively metaphysical. In the province of Greek grammar, this may be seen in Gottfried Hermann's definition of the subjunctive as the mood of objective possibility, and of the optative as the mood of subjective possibility. Later the optative came to be quite generally regarded as the " mood of an act conceived " (" Modus der Vorstellung, Modus des rein Gedachten"); while the Greek subjunctive was generally held to be the mood of an act conditioned. See especially Hale, A Century of Metaphysical Syntax, op. cit. p. 191 ff. For Latin, the prevalent view came to be that the subjunctive was the " mood of an act conceived," and this conception is found not only in Zumpt (Lat. Gramm. § 78), Madvig (Lat. Gramm. § 346), Kühner (Ausführliche lat. Gramm. ii, p. 130), and in Dräger (Hist. Syntax der lat. Spr. i, p. 305), but was also accepted by Schmalz in the first edition of his Syntax und Stilistik (1885); while in his De coniunctivo latino and his Bedeutung der Modi, loc. cit. p. 414 ff., Lattmann refers a large group of Latin subjunctive uses to an Indo-European " fictivus," which he regards as representing one phase of the original optative, but which is merely a " Modus der Vorstellung " under a new name.

In his Gebrauch des Conjunktivs und Optativs im Sanskrit und Griechischen, published in 1871, Delbrück broke new ground. Basing his conclusions upon the employment of the subjunctive and optative in independent sentences in the oldest monuments of Sanskrit and Greek, he recognized two fundamental forces for the Indo-

European subjunctive: will and pure futurity; likewise two for the optative: wish and potential force. In case of the subjunctive, Delbrück regarded the 'will' notion as original; the future force as derived from this. In case of the optative, he regarded the 'wish' notion as original; the potential as derived from that. Delbrück's essential positions were soon assailed. In an essay entitled, De coniunctivi et optativi in Indo-Europaeis linguis informatione et vi antiquissima, pp. 41 ff. and 57 ff., Bergaigne questioned the justi-fication of attaching to either subjunctive or optative the meanings assigned to these moods by Delbrück. He points out that in the oldest Sanskrit there are instances where the subjunctive denotes a wish and the optative denotes an act of willing. In Greek, Ber-gaigne admits, there is substantial conformity of usage to Delbrück's theories, but this he explains as a special Greek development. Originally, he holds, the subjunctive and optative possessed no such precise meaning as attached to them by Delbrück, but covered all the ground of modality outside the field of categorical statement occupied by the indicative. He was influenced to this conclusion by his belief that in the development of language the direction of movement is from the vague to the more definite.

Delbrück in his Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax, published soon after Bergaigne's essay, p. 115 ff., replies briefly to Bergaigne's criticisms. He admits that in the history of grammatical forms we cannot with certainty go back beyond a variety of typical usages; but that this variety represents the original state of affairs, must, in view of what we know from other sources concerning the development of language, be characterized as improbable. Delbrück further admits that in Vedic Sanskrit the distinction in the use of moods is not as consistent as in Greek. But he suggests that the freedom referred to may be a result partly of the type of literature to which the Vedas belong. At all events Delbrück thinks it incontrovertible that no small number of subjunctive and optative uses in Sanskrit, Iranian, and Greek show such an agreement that they can be ex-plained only as the result of historical development from a common origin.

As to the relation of the two uses of the subjunctive to each other, and of the two uses of the optative to each other, Delbrück suggests

the possibility of starting in the case of the subjunctive with the pure future meaning; and in case of the optative with the notion of remoter futurity. But he does not discuss this further, merely observing that any such conception of relationships would involve an entirely different classification of the material as treated in his earlier work.

In his Altindische Syntax, however, published in 1888, p. 302, Delbrück expressly recognizes the difficulty of deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish, and simply contents himself with recognizing the respective uses without attempting to explain the relationship. As regards the subjunctive, he apparently still holds to the derivation of the future use from the subjunctive of will.

Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, p. 371 ff., while recognizing the essential forces of the subjunctive and optative as outlined by Delbrück, disputes Delbrück's view that the notion of will is basal in the subjunctive, and the notion of wishing in the optative. Goodwin believes that in the case of each mood the process was exactly the reverse. In the case of the subjunctive he urges that it is rela- tively easy to derive the 'will' uses from the idea of simple futurity. Thus in ἴωμεν, 'we shall go,' and in ἴωμεν, 'let us go,' we have in each case a future notion; in the second case we have something in ad- dition. Thus by assuming the future notion as basal, we secure the advantage of finding our basal notion present in both instances, whereas if we start with the 'will' notion as basal, we have in the future use of the subjunctive no trace of the original idea. Similarly Goodwin finds difficulty in deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish. "Surely," says he, "ἀπόλοιτο ἄν, 'he would perish,' can never have developed from ἀπόλοιτο, 'may he perish'; for the former is no more likely to be said by anyone who wishes the death of a person than by one who fears it." In view of the difficulty of deriving the potential optative from the optative of wish, Goodwin therefore urges starting with the potential meaning as basal, and would derive the optative of wish from that,—in what way, he does not make clear.

A more recent statement of Delbrück's position is found in his Vergleichende Syntax, ii, p. 346 ff. Here, in discussing the subjunc- tive, he recognizes the two fundamental meanings of will and futu-

rity, but enters into no discussion of their relationship. With regard
to the optative, he recognizes three uses: of wish, prescriptive, and
potential, deriving the second and third from the first. He thus
returns to his original position as announced in his Gebrauch des
Conjunktivs und Optativs. Some of the evidence he brings to bear
on the general problem is worth citing here. Thus in Iranian we find
the optative of wish and the prescriptive optative. In Germanic the
optative occurs in its wishing, prescriptive, and potential functions.

Brugmann follows Delbrück, with certain reservations. In his
Griechische Grammatik[3], § 552, he says, in substance, on the subject
of the original value of the subjunctive and optative: "The forms
we call subjunctive, the forms we call optative, and the forms we call
imperative are severally composed of various morphological elements.
Hence it is quite natural that each of these moods should possess a
variety of syntactical functions unrelated to each other. E.g. the
optative denoted wishing and capacity. Each mood, even in the
time of the parent-speech, possessed a variety of functions whose
historical relation to each other is not clear. It is, therefore, im-
possible to postulate a single fundamental meaning for these moods
in the Ursprache. Much less can we lay down any such single fun-
damental meaning for them in any single Indo-European language,
as Sanskrit, Latin, or Greek." In conformity with this attitude,
Brugmann contents himself with recognizing three functions for the
Indo-European subjunctive, and two functions for the Indo-European
optative. The three functions of the subjunctive are: volitive, de-
liberative, future. The two functions of the optative are: wishing,
potential. While expressly disclaiming any attempt to establish a
genetic relationship between these functions, Brugmann nevertheless
suggests as regards the optative, that if either of them is to be derived
from the other, it is much easier to derive the 'wish' meaning from
the potential than *vice versa,* and in support of this he cites (§ 558, N)
the development of the German *mögen,* originally designating poten-
tiality (cf. *es mag sein*), but later acquiring the force of wishing, e.g.
möge es ihm gelingen!

Morris in Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 392 ff. takes a position closely
akin to that of Bergaigne, but somewhat less extreme. Bergaigne
had denied to the subjunctive and optative any "Grundbegriff"

whatever.   Morris admits for the two moods a vague notion of
desire as basal, and believes that this vague notion gradually as-
sumed definiteness as a result of context, verb meaning, voice, tense,
number, person, gesture, intonation, etc.   As to the way in which
the potential force developed in the optative, and the future force in
the subjunctive, he is apparently not clear in his conception.

H. Lattmann in his De conjunctivo latino (1896) and in an article
in Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik, 1903, p. 410 ff.,
dissents radically from Delbrück's conclusions, both as regards the
Indo-European functions of the subjunctive and optative, and the pos-
sibility of deriving the future force from the volitive, or the potential
idea from that of wishing.   To Lattmann's mind the subjunctive
functions in Indo-European were two: potential and imperative
(= volitive); the optative functions were likewise two: " fictive "
and wishing.   The potential and "fictive" functions were, according
to Lattmann, the original ones; the imperative and wishing functions
were derived from these.

Mutzbauer, Konjunktiv und Optativ und ihre Entwickelung im
Griechischen, p. 4 ff., recognizes only the future force as present in
the Greek (and Indo-European) subjunctive.   For the optative,
p. 143 ff., he follows Delbrück.

Stahl, Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums,
p. 220 ff., is a pronounced adherent of Delbrück, and fortifies his
views as to the relationship of the functions of the subjunctive and
optative by certain new considerations, which will be mentioned later.

Mention should perhaps also be made of the reactionary view of
Kruczkiewickz, set forth in Zeitschrift für österreichische Gymna-
sien, 1894, p. 694 ff.   A fundamental postulate with Delbrück had been
that the use of the subjunctive and optative in subordinate clauses
is later than their use in principal clauses, and that the former are
to be explained from the latter.   Kruczkiewickz denies the truth of
this principle and declares moreover that it breaks down when ap-
plied, — especially to Latin, — except in a few instances.   He is, there-
fore, led to seek the original force of the subjunctive elsewhere than
in principal sentences, and turns to the testimony of the Latin
grammarians, in whose minds, he declares, a just sense of the true
force of the mood might be expected still to persist.   These, he

urges, not only called the subjunctive the mood of subordination (*subiunctivus*), but they actually *define* it as the mood of subordinate clauses, and declare that it is incapable of independent use. On this basis he declares the subjunctive to be the mood of "a dependent, relative, only partially valid statement" ("ein Modus der unselb-ständigen, relativen, nur beziehungsweise giltigen Aussage"). The use of the subjunctive in principal clauses Kruczkiewickz explains as derived by ellipsis from its employment in subordinate clauses. He even asserts that the employment of the subjunctive and opta-tive in independent sentences in Indo-European would have been not only unnecessary but superfluous, since the ideas supposed to belong to them were expressed by other formations, e.g. the imperative, the in-junctive, the future, the conditionalis (as in Sanskrit).

Another radical view is that of Armin Dittmar, set forth some-what vaguely in his Studien zur lateinischen Tempus- und Modus-lehre. Dittmar defines the subjunctive as expressing an idea that is "polemisch," as opposed to the function of the indicative, which he denominates as "souverän."

Before passing a brief criticism on the foregoing views, it is desirable to get before us as clearly as possible the essential facts of usage of the subjunctive and optative in the different Indo-European languages, so far as they have a bearing on our problem.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

Sanskrit. — *Volitive.* — In its volitive use the subjunctive appears in Sanskrit in expressions like, 'I am resolved to be a disciple of Brahma;' 'we are resolved to find;' 'let us confer together;' 'mount the chariot;' 'listen to my words;' negative: 'smite us not in the battle;' 'fear not.'

Future. In its future use the Sanskrit subjunctive appears in such expressions as 'you will please me;' 'the red of the morning will appear;' interrogative: 'who will give it to you?'

Greek. *Volitive.* In Greek the affirmative volitive uses are con-fined almost exclusively to the first person, e.g. ἐγὼ δῶ ξείνιον, 'I am determined to give him a guest-present,' or 'let me give him;' ἡμεῖς φραζώμεθα, 'let us consider.' Negative: μὴ λεγώμεθα; μὴ ποιήσῃς.

Future. The future use in Greek is confined practically to Homer,

and is generally accompanied by κέν or ἄν, e.g. ἐγὼ δέ κ᾽ ἄγω Βρισηίδα; τάχ᾽ ἄν ποτε θυμὸν ὀλέσσῃ. Without κέν or ἄν: οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἴδον ἀνέρας οὐδέ ἴδωμαι.

Latin. *Volitive* uses are well represented in the Latin hortatory, jussive, and prohibitive. Future uses have disappeared, except in so far as they are exhibited in the future indicative in -*am* (*regam*, *audiam*, etc.), and the future perfect indicative. These formations were by origin subjunctive.

Germanic. In Germanic, subjunctive forms have disappeared, but subjunctive functions (volitive and future) have passed to the optative, as, ' let us make here three tabernacles;' ' be kindly disposed;' ' lie not.'

Slavic. In Slavic also the subjunctive formation has disappeared, but, as in Germanic, traces of the volitive use are found in the optative.

The deliberative also occurs in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Germanic (in the latter, only as a function of optative forms); but this usage, though apparently Indo-European, is probably developed from the volitive.

OPTATIVE.

Sanskrit. *In wishes*, e.g. in such expressions as, 'may I become rich in herds;' ' may we be held righteous in the eyes of the gods;' ' may this blessing be our portion;' negative : ' may he not escape destruction.'

Prescriptive. This is essentially jussive in its character, being employed where the command or direction involves a permanent or habitual line of conduct, as opposed to a single act; e.g. 'let one give a child a name when it is born.'

Potential. Inasmuch as the word 'potential' is loosely used, it may be well to observe that the only uses here referred to by this term are the 'should'-'would' uses, and the 'may' uses, especially the former. 'Can' potentials, so far as they occur, are a late and special development; 'must' potentials do not occur at all. Examples: ('should'-'would' type): 'what would you give him?' 'I should give him to eat.'

Iranian. *In wishes;* e.g. 'may he come to our help.'

Prescriptive; e.g. ' worship me with this ritual.'

Greek. *In wishes;* e.g. ἀμύμονα οἴκοι ἄκοιτιν εὕροιμι; ἔλθοις ἐς πατρίδα; σοὶ δὲ θεοὶ χάριν δοῖεν; μὴ ἀπολοίμην.

Prescriptive; e.g. μὴ ἀθεμίστιος εἴη ἀλλ' σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχοι.

Permissive; e.g. κτήματα δ' αὐτὸς ἔχοις, 'you may have the property.'

Potential. The only certain types are the 'should'-'would' and the 'may' potentials; e.g. οὐκ ἂν δεχοίμην τοῦτο; ἕλοιμί κε ἠ̈ κεν ἀλοίην, 'I may slay or I may be slain.' When Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, § 234, renders οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, by 'this could not happen;' ἀνὴρ δέ κεν οὔ τι Διὸς νοὸν εἰρύσσαιτο, by 'a man cannot contend against the will of Zeus,' he seems to me to be substituting an English idiom for an exact translation of the Greek modal force. So in § 235, where he renders πάντες θαυμάζοιεν ἂν τοῦτο, 'all must admire this,' but which can perfectly well mean, 'all would admire.'

Latin. The Latin subjunctive bears witness to its optative inheritance in its use in wishes, and in potential meanings. The 'should'-'would' potential is the main type, but the 'may' potential occurs sparingly (*aliquis dicat, quispiam dixerit,* etc.), while we also find a 'can'-'could' potential in expressions of the type: *videas,* 'one can see'; *videres,* 'one could see.' This, however, seems an outgrowth of the 'should'-'would' use. Delbrück would see traces of the prescriptive use in general directions, e.g. Cato, Agr. 5, 1, disciplina bona utatur; feriae serventur; alieno manum abstineat.

Germanic. The Gothic exhibits the wish use in such expressions as, 'may God grant.' The potential use is also authenticated.

Balto-Slavic. Lithuanian shows the permissive use.

It is on the basis of the foregoing evidence that Delbrück and his adherents recognize the volitive and future uses as Indo-European functions of the subjunctive, and the wish and potential uses as Indo-European functions of the optative. In the main, I believe, the evidence warrants the conclusion drawn from it by Delbrück. Yet certain facts of usage in Sanskrit and Greek must not be ignored. In the earliest Sanskrit, on which Delbrück's conclusions as to that language mainly rest, the subjunctive is not restricted exclusively to the volitive and future uses; nor is the optative confined exclusively to wishes and potential functions. So also in Greek the subjunctive at times appears in wishes, while the pre-

scriptive optative is essentially volitive in character, as is also the optative in requests. Yet even in Sanskrit there is a decided preponderance of the functions recognized by Delbrück for the subjunctive and optative, while in Greek these functions are practically the rule. That two moods, representing functions so closely related as those of will and wish, should occasionally interchange, is hardly surprising. Such interchange would be but the manifestation of the tendency which in Latin led to the fusion of the subjunctive and optative, and in Sanskrit and Germanic resulted finally in the absorption of the subjunctive in the optative.

Whitney, Amer. Jour. Phil. xiii, p. 294, in his review of Delbrück's Altindische Syntax (Syntaxtische Forschungen, v), refuses to accept Delbrück's doctrine that the fundamental distinction between the subjunctive and optative is the expression by the former of an action willed, by the latter of an action wished. "To this doctrine," he says, "I have never been able to give my assent, especially for these reasons: I do not find a sufficiently well-marked difference of sense of the kind asserted between the two modes, but only such a preponderance, on the whole, of the sense of wishing on the side of the optative as might easily come about by gradual differentiation of usage between two originally equivalent formations." But, as Delbrück observes in his Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 351, the question of the absolutely original values of the subjunctive and optative is not involved in his theories. He aims only to set forth the values attributable to these moods in the parent-speech as shown by the evidence of the separate languages. How these forces were developed, — whether by a process of selective differentiation or otherwise, is a topic he does not aim to discuss.

It remains to consider the other views which have been mentioned as to the force of the subjunctive and optative, along with the theories as to the relationship of the several functions of each mood. These views may be grouped under four heads:

1. The metaphysical theories of those who regard the subjunctive and optative as the moods of an act conditioned, or an act conceived, etc.

2. The views of those who refuse to attach to the subjunctive and optative any definite fundamental notion whatever.

3. The views of those who admit the existence of a fundamental

notion or notions in these moods, but differ in their conception of these meanings.

4. The theories as to the relationship to each other of the notions recognized in each mood.

The commonest form of the metaphysical theory of the subjunctive and optative is that which represents the Greek optative and Latin subjunctive as the mood of an idea, or of an act conceived. But that so abstract and highly sublimated a conception should have been fundamental with a primitive shepherd folk, seems incredible. Any such view is at variance with the well-attested fact that language develops from the concrete to the abstract, not from the abstract to the concrete. The view referred to is rather a product of an excessively metaphysical temperament, dominated by current philosophical theories and seeking to bring into accord with these theories all phenomena of history and life, including language. But the phenomena of language are not essentially logical; they are rather psychological and sociological. As such, they demand inductive methods of consideration, not *a priori* hypotheses. The setting up of a meaning for an inflected form as vague and indefinite as that of an act conceived, or " ein polemischer Modus " (Dittmar), seems therefore a serious error of method.

I pass to a consideration of the views of those who hold that inflected forms in general and the forms of the subjunctive and optative in particular possessed no definite meaning in Indo-European. These views are represented especially by Bergaigne and Morris. Bergaigne maintains that words did not originally designate precise concepts. In support of this he declares that children at play have been known to allow one and the same word to do duty as the designation of many totally different objects. He assumes that the same practice characterized primitive speech, and that words started with a very vague meaning, developing definiteness with time. But it is extremely doubtful whether the psychology of the child is identical with that of the mature intellects of even primitive people. Nor is it clear that the circumstance he cites from child life represents more than an isolated vagary. Bergaigne also attaches too much importance to the fact that exceptions to precision of use of the subjunctive and optative occur in early Sanskrit.

Morris, while attaching a slightly more definite conception to the subjunctive and optative, refuses to admit that they possessed any "Grundbegriff." The vague meaning of desire which he attaches to both moods he conceives to have developed (by the various factors already enumerated) to the functions we observe in the history of the different Indo-European languages. But it is impossible to understand how so vague a value as attached by either Bergaigne or Morris to the subjunctive and optative in Indo-European could have developed with such surprising uniformity in the different languages. Nothing but the assumption of distinct functions in Indo-European will account for the presence in the separate languages of substantially the same functions in the employment of subjunctive and optative.

Coming to the question of what meanings shall be recognized as fundamental for the two moods, we find to-day (on the part of those who believe in a "Grundbegriff") a wide — almost a general — recognition of the Indo-European character of the functions attributed by Delbrück to the subjunctive and optative. Such recognition is accorded, for example, by Brugmann, Stahl, Hale, Goodwin, and many others. Brugmann goes further than Delbrück in the case of the subjunctive, and recognizes the deliberative use as Indo-European. Of the correctness of this there can hardly be any doubt. The only question is whether the deliberative use should be accorded independent recognition, or merely be regarded as a sub-type of the volitive. The chief dissent from Delbrück on the general question of what "Grundbegriffe" should be recognized, comes from Mutzbauer and Lattmann. Mutzbauer agrees with Delbrück in part, viz. as regards the optative. As to the subjunctive he dissents, holding that mood to be the mood of "Erwartung" or expectancy. This conception is in accord with Delbrück for a part of the subjunctive uses, viz. those designated by Delbrück as pure future. But when Mutzbauer attempts to bring under the same head such expressions as Δ 13, ἡμεῖς δὲ φραζώμεθα; A 62, ἀλλ' ἄγε τίνα μάντιν ἐρείομεν; A 26, μή σε γέρον κιχείω; B 435, μηκέτι αὖθι λεγώμεθα, he seems guilty of forcing the interpretation to support a theory. I hold it impossible to refute the existence in large numbers in the Homeric poems of subjunctive uses in which the mere conception of "Erwartung" fails to do justice to the modal force.

Lattmann's position is more radical. He disputes Delbrück's conclusions, in part, as to both moods. While recognizing the volitive use of the subjunctive, he rejects the future use. To him the subjunctive is partly volitive (imperative), partly potential. The optative, he holds, is employed partly in wishes, partly in a so-called "fictive" use. This latter is in no wise different from the conception of the optative as the "Modus der Vorstellung." The serious objections to such a conception have already been set forth in connection with our consideration of the metaphysical theories of the moods, and need not be repeated here. Lattmann's conception of one phase of the subjunctive as potential, however, demands a word of comment. In support of his position, Lattmann gives no adequate material. He cites Z 459, καί ποτέ τις εἴπῃσιν, with the implication that this represents a frequent and typical usage. But such is not the case, and this particular example, of which he makes much, is by most interpreters taken as an illustration of the pure future use; cf. Latin *aliquis dicet.* Lattmann takes no account of the multitude of Homeric subjunctives where the force is a pure future and nothing else. The common potential function seen in the Greek optative Lattmann does not recognize as potential. Instead, he brings it under his "fictive," a conception so broad and vague as to be capable of including almost anything, including infinitives, gerunds, and even the uses of the future and future perfect indicative, did one wish to do so.

Coming to the mutual relationship of the functions of each mood, we find ourselves on very difficult ground. Delbrück's views on this point cannot be said to have met with general acceptance, even on the part of those who accept his conclusions as to the values to be attached to the subjunctive and optative. Brugmann's attitude is that the different functions were, in the case of the subjunctive, very likely originally unrelated, owing to the variety of subjunctive formation. In the case of the optative, while there is no such variety of formation, he nevertheless hesitates to commit himself positively in favor of any theory of relationship of the wish and potential functions. Goodwin's position has already been stated. He holds that the future meaning was original with the subjunctive, and that the volitive meaning developed from that. So in the case of the opta-

tive, he starts with the remote future (potential) notion, and regards the wish notion as an outgrowth of that.   Stahl, Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums, p. 234 ff., accepts Delbrück's views as to the relation of the functions of each mood, and supports them by the following arguments :

Subjunctive.   In favor of the development of the future function of the subjunctive from the volitive, Stahl, arguing for Greek, urges :

1. The volitive force is the permanent one, while after Homer the future force disappears in independent sentences.

2. The volitive function does not depend upon any reënforcing particles, while in the case of the future use in Homer we find κέν, ἄν associated with the subjunctive.

3. That the future force of the subjunctive was not fundamental and original, is shown by the fact that a special form for the future developed.   Had the future force been original with the subjunctive, a separate form for the future indicative would have been super-fluous.

4. Had the future meaning been original, it is not easy to see how the volitive, developing from this, would have restricted itself to the first person (as it does in affirmative sentences), for in the future use in Homer we find all persons.

5. Remnants of present indicatives in Homer employed as futures point to a time when the volitive use had not yet developed a future force.

6. In the case of the future indicative we find at times a second-ary volitive force.   It is quite in harmony with that to assume that the subjunctive (originally volitive) secondarily developed a future force.

7. The development of the volitive meaning to the future is sud-ported by analogous phenomena in other languages; e.g. in modern Greek the future is regularly formed by the auxiliary θέλω; in Eng-lish it is formed by the auxiliary ' will.'

Optative.   In favor of the development of the potential[1] meaning from that of wishing, Stahl urges :

---

[1] It is greatly to be regretted that Stahl employs the designation " Optativ der Vor-stellung " for the potential uses.   However, his examples show that he does not use the term in the objectionable sense discussed above (p. 147), but only to cover poten-tial functions.

1. The other functions of the optative are easily referred to the use in wishes for their origin.

2. In Homer the potential optative regularly takes the particles κέν, ἄν, while in the wish use no particle is necessary. This would hardly be the case, had the potential meaning been original.

3. That the wish meaning of the optative is original, is supported by the analogy of the subjunctive.

Brugmann, Lattmann, and others cite the German *möge er kommen*, etc., in support of the theory that the wish meaning of the optative developed from the potential. But in *möge er kommen*, it is the subjunctive form *möge* that conveys the notion of wishing, — 'may he be able.' Did the German use *er mag kommen* in the sense of 'may he come,' there might be some force in the argument that a development from the potential meaning to the wish meaning was possible and natural.

It remains to consider briefly the theory of Kruczkiewickz, who maintains that the subjunctive was primarily the mood of subordination. In support of this thesis, Kruczkiewickz urges the circumstance (for Latin) that the Latin grammarians not only designate the subjunctive as *modus subiunctivus*, but define it as the 'mood of subordination.' As regards the designation, the Roman grammarians, of course, were slavishly following the nomenclature of the Greeks. As regards the definition, it should be noted that those grammarians who define the subjunctive as the mood of subordination recognize also a *iussivus*, a *concessivus*, and an *optativus*, designations clearly intended to cover the independent uses of the subjunctive. But quite apart from these considerations, the assumption that the Roman grammarians were in the least qualified to pass intelligently upon the fundamental force of an inflected form, must be regarded as naïve. Kruczkiewickz's conclusions are based upon the theory that the principal clause is younger than the subordinate, — a theory which contradicts all accepted views of the history of language; while his methods of deriving the independent uses of the Latin subjunctive from subordinate uses are highly arbitrary and fantastic.

My own position is this: I agree with Delbrück in his recognition of fundamental uses; volitive and future for the Indo-European subjunctive; wishing and potential for the Indo-European optative.

These potential uses are the 'may' and 'should '-' would' potentials. To them jointly I have elsewhere given the name of 'contingent futurity,' a designation which I shall employ also in my subsequent discussion of the potential uses of the Latin subjunctive. The Deliberative I regard with Brugmann as also Indo-European, but I consider it a volitive development and shall treat it as such.

As regards the relationship of the volitive and future forces of the subjunctive, and of the wish and potential forces of the optative, I do not feel the same positiveness of conviction. The position of Delbrück seems to me plausible, and the arguments adduced in its support by Stahl and others are weighty, but to my mind not sufficiently so to be regarded as final. The question of relationship is, after all, of secondary importance. Whatever the facts of relationship, — whether the volitive and true optative are the origin of the future and potential uses, or *vice versa*, or whether there is no relationship between the two uses of each mood, — the important question is as to the existence of the uses themselves and as to their Indo-European character. In this matter I believe Delbrück stands on firm ground.

CLASSIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT USES OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE.

VOLITIVE USES.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF DETERMINED RESOLUTION.[1]

In the first person singular of the present subjunctive the volitive force appears in a few instances:[2] Bacch. 1058, taceam; Men. 983, metum id mihi adhibeam, culpam abstineam; Most. 849, videam; H. T. 273, mane: hoc quod coepi primum enarrem.

In two instances the volitive force is so weakened that the subjunctive expresses merely a proposal (Hale-Buck, 501, 2). Thus:

---

[1] Cf. Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, 501, 1; Riemann, Syntaxe Latine, § 165, b, Rem.; Blase, Historische Grammatik der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 113; Morris, Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 134 ff.; Lindsay, Syntax of Plautus, p. 64.

[2] Cf. Sanskrit, brahmacâry àsâni, 'I am resolved to become a disciple of Brahma,' cited by Delbrück, Conjunctiv und Optativ im Sanskrit und Griechischen, p. 18.

Trin. 748, vide si hoc utibile deputas: ipsum adeam, edoceam; 1136, sed maneam, opinor; Phor. 140, ad precatorem adeam, credo.

In many cases the form is ambiguous, though analogy suggests that we have the subjunctive. Thus Curc. 160, mane: suffundam aquolam; Most. 1090, mane: experiar, ut opinor; Stat. 90, mane: coepiam, are all strikingly similar to H. T. 273 above cited. But inasmuch as the first person singular of the future was always the prevailing method of expressing the speaker's will, it is quite probable that these ambiguous examples may all be futures.[1] Blase (Hist. Lat. Gram. iii, 1, p. 113) brings under this head all cases with *certumst* and *potius*, e.g. Amph. 1048, certumst intro rumpam; Poen. 922, uni potius intus ero odio, quam hic sim vobis omnibus. But these are better regarded as subordinate. See below, p. 236; 244.

In Am. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 313 ff., and in Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, vi, p. 217 ff., Elmer would see in the above examples that I have cited as subjunctives of determined resolution, potentials in which the 'should'-'would' notion has developed into an 'ought' notion. But the reasons which he adduces in favor of this theory are not convincing.

Two of the above examples (Bacch. 1058; Most. 849) are possibly instances of self-exhortation, like Bacch. 1049, properem perdere (see below, p. 167).

THE JUSSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.[2]

The jussive subjunctive primarily gives expression to a command or order. Often the force is so weakened or modified as to convey simply a warning, admonition, or request. It is also employed in curses and in prescribing the terms of a compact. In the main it represents the utterance of one speaking with authority, real or assumed.

The jussive is used in the second and third persons singular and plural, though the plural forms — especially in the second person — are very rare. The present tense is the one usually employed; but in a few instances the perfect appears. Reënforcing particles, especially *ut* (*uti*), *modo*, *ut modo*, are frequently added.

[1] On the difficulty of distinguishing the mood in such cases, see Morris, l.c., p. 135 f.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 114.

[2] Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 146 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr., iii, 1, p. 125 ff.; 200 ff.

Just how far the material brought under this head goes back to the prescriptive optative (see p. 154), is, of course, impossible to determine. Delbrück would recognize an optative origin in such examples of the subjunctive as those in the contract in Asin. 756 ff.; also (with a negative) in passages like Cato, Agr. 83, mulier ad rem divinam ne adsit; 5, 3, iniussu domini credat nemini. See Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 386.

PRESENT JUSSIVE.

No Introductory Particle.

SECOND SINGULAR.

Examples: Amph. 819, sumas; Asin. 99, iubeas; Bacch. 417, morem geras; 990, taceas; Capt. 551, procul recedas; Curc. 270, pacem petas; M. G. 1101, dicas; Poen. 330, adeas; M. G. 807, memineris; And. 598, quiescas; Hec. 638, accipias puerum; Ad. 431, morem geras; Cato, Agr. 36, spargas, irriges; 61, 1, ares; Frag. (Jord.), p. 79, 7; emas non quod opus est, sed quod necesse est; Lucil. 394, hominem habeas; 712 a, dicas.

There are about one hundred other instances of the 2d singular jussive in Early Latin. As a rule the reference is to a definite second person.

THIRD SINGULAR.

Examples: Amph. 950, gubernatorem arcessat; Asin. 772, abs ted accipiat; Aul. 600, properet persequi; Bacch. 662, ita animum habeat; Capt. 63, litis contrahat; M. G. 1126, abeat; Pers. 68, det in publicum; Poen. 905, eas adserat; Pseud. 570, det locum; Trin. 765, homo conducatur, exornetur; Truc. 232, tum amet; And. 895, dicat; H. T. 722, traducatur Bacchis; Eun. 5, existumet; Phor. 677, illis repudium renuntiet; Hec. 502, renumeret dotem, eat; Ad. 77, fateatur nescire; Cato, Agr. 1, 3, sub radice montis siet; in meridiem spectet; 5, 1, disciplina bona utatur; 80, encytum ad eundem modum facito, nisi calicem pertusum habeat; cf. 82, where *nisi* connects imperatives, — spaeritam sic facito, nisi sic fingito; 87, indat, addat; CIL, i, 199, 29, posidere liceat.

There are about one hundred further examples in Early Latin of the 3d singular present in the jussive use.

<div align="center">SECOND PLURAL.</div>

Examples of the second plural present in the jussive use are extremely rare. I have noted only the following: Curc. 632, quaeratis chlamydem unde pervenerit; M. G. 1341, bene, quaeso, inter vos dicatis; Enn. Ann. 244, 2, memoretis loqui me; Pacuv. 188, concorditatem conservetis; Afran. 103, meum concelebretis diem; formula of adrogatio in Gell. v, 19, 9, velitis, iubeatis.

<div align="center">THIRD PLURAL.</div>

Of this usage only about thirty instances are found in Early Latin. Examples: Amph. 389, indutiae parumper fiant; Asin. 759, fores occlusae omnibus sint nisi tibi; Bacch. 1133, cogantur intro; Cas. 744, hisce abeant; Curc. 298, sese domi contineant, vitent infortunio; Pers. 352, eant maxumam malam crucem; Poen. 24, aes dent, domum abeant, vitent infortunio; 32, tacitae spectent, tacitae rideant, tinnire temperent, domum conferant; 746, suspendant se; H. T. 745, ecferant; Hec. 511, inter se transigant; Trag. Incert. 112, ita parent se; Naev. Com. 112, linguis faveant atque adnutent; Cato, Agr. 2, 5, satis accipiantur; 2, 6, locentur; 23, 1, sarciantur; laventur, picentur; parentur, sarciantur, emantur, salliantur; 31, 1, parentur; 57, bibant; 67, 1, 2, habeant, curent, capiant; 117, contundantur, deiciantur; 130, perbibant; 144, 5, iurent; 160, teneant; Frag. (Jord.), p. 70, 1, revortantur; CIL, i, 199, 25, vectigal dent; 45, ad nos adeant.

<div align="center">### Jussive with Introductory Particles.</div>

The particles used are *ut* (*uti*), *modo*, at times combined with *at*. Occasionally *modo ut* is found. *Ut* in this use is probably an indefinite adverb, corresponding in its force and semasiology to the indefinite adverb *qui*, 'somehow,' 'only,' 'just.' The three meanings of the adverb *qui* are well substantiated, viz.:

1. Relative, 'in which way,' 'as.'
2. Interrogative, 'how?'
3. Indefinite, 'somehow;' cf. *modo*, originally, 'in a way,' 'in some way,' 'somehow,' 'only.'

In case of the corresponding particle *ut*, we have:

1. Relative *ut*, 'in which way,' 'as.'
2. Interrogative *ut*, 'how?'

If, now, we recognize an indefinite *ut*, we get for *ut* the third of the three meanings attaching to *qui*. This value seems to occur also in *uti-nam*, and to be supported by the use of *qui* and *ut* interchangeably in connection with independent optatives; see below, p. 193. Others, however, e.g. Kienitz, Probst (Beiträge zur lateinischen Grammatik, ii, p. 148) refer the use of *ut* under discussion to an interrogative origin. But satisfactory explanations of the assumed process of development are not offered.

The material for Early Latin follows:[1] Bacch. 739, proin tu ab eo ut caveas tibi; Capt. 115, sed uti adserventur; Curc. 130, periisse ut te dicas; 257, operam ut det; Epid. 267, arbitretur uxor atque ut fidicinam ulciscare; Pers. 151, longe ab Athenis esse se gnatam autumet et ut adfleat; Poen. 29, domi ut procurent; Stich. 106, sed utraque ut dicat; 113, ut omnibus os obturent; 711, modo nostra huc amica accedat; Trin. 347, bene si amico feceris, ne pigeat fecisse; ut potius pudeat, si non feceris;[2] And. 316, ut te arbitretur sibi paratum moechum; H. T. 470, per alium quemvis ut des, falli te sinas; 572, at certe ut hinc concedas; 1056, ut uxorem ducas; Eun. 339, ut nunties patri; Phor. 212, em, istuc serva; et verbum verbo, par pari ut respondeas; Hec. 78, uti tum dicas; Ad. 280, at ut omne reddat; 398, sic siet modo; 741, id arte ut corrigas; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, ut introeas et circumspicias; uti bonum caelum habeat; 2, 6, uti conpareat, uti paretur, uti veneant; uti imperet et relinquat; auctionem uti faciat; 21, 5, uti idem faber figat; 22, 1, librator uti statuatur; CIL, i, 199, 41, id uti facere liceat; 196, 23, haice uti exdeicatis.

I should put here also the three following examples, all of which are in the 1st singular : Pers. 542, videam modo mercimonium, 'just let me see the goods.' This is just as clearly an order as if it read, *monstres mihi modo mercimonium.* The other examples are: Pers. 575, modo uti sciam ; And. 711, at tamen. : : quid ergo? : : ut ducam. All three of these passages are clear orders,[3] — different on the one hand from the expressions of resolve above cited (p. 161), and

---

[1] See also Dahl, Die lateinische Partikel VT, 1882, p. 293 f.; Schnoor, Der Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus, 1885, p. 1 ff.

[2] Leo and Lindsay indicate by their punctuation that they take the *ut*-clause here as dependent. The Götz-Schöll punctuation is decidedly to be preferred. Cf. Morris on Capt. 115.

[3] Cf. Homer, A, 26, μή σε κιχήω, equivalent to 'don't be found !'

on the other from expressions of self-exhortation cited below
(p. 167). Some may be inclined to see in the two Persa passages
examples of provisos. But such an interpretation does violence to
the sense.

Not a few scholars regard the foregoing examples as dependent
upon some verb, such as *fac, vide, cura, volo, velim, opto*, etc., to be
supplied in thought. So Dahl, op. cit., p. 293. Cf. Fairclough, on
And. 712; Ashmore, on the Terentian passages cited above. But it
is not easy to supply an ellipsis in these passages. It seems much
more natural to see in them specimens of an early usage out of which,
through parataxis, later hypotaxis developed.[1] Nevertheless it is
impossible to draw a hard and fast line between independent and de-
pendent uses. Nor is it necessary that this should be done in all
cases. In admitting examples to a place in the preceding list, I have
endeavored to be conservative, and have gone further than some
scholars in excluding doubtful passages. Thus Morris, on Capt. 115,
cites Rud. 1030, ecquid condicionis audes ferre ? : : iam dudum fero,
ut abeas, rudentem amittas. This may possibly be independent.
At the same time it may depend upon *condicionem* to be supplied in
thought with *fero*.

The Perfect Jussive.

The material is scanty : Bacch. 840, quis igitur obsecrost ? : :
inveneris; ex me quidem numquam eris certior; Trin. 1054, vel illud
perdas vel amicum amiseris; Ad. 437, de istoc viderit. This last is
quite commonly regarded as a future-perfect, e.g. by Dziatzko ad
loc. ; but the subjunctive is much more natural (so Blase, Hist. Gramm.
der lat. Spr. iii, p. 184). Enn. Trag. 239, prohibesseis scelus.

So far as these instances indicate, there is no difference of force
between the present and perfect subjunctive in the jussive use.

The Hortatory Subjunctive.[2]

Under this head I bring 1st person plurals of the present sub-
junctive, like *faciamus*, 'let us make!' A single instance of the 1st
singular will be discussed below. The regular negative of the hor-
tatory subjunctive is *ne*, but I have noted but one instance of this in

---

[1] Cf. Schnoor, op. cit., p. 1.
[2] See especially Morris, Independent Subjunctive, p. 155.

Early Latin. There is also one instance with *non*, and one intro-
duced by the connecting negative *nec*. About one-half of the affirma-
tive examples consist of *eamus, adeamus, abeamus*, or other com-
pounds of *eo*.

FIRST PLURAL HORTATORY.

Affirmative.

Examples: Amph. 543, eamus; so Bacch. 105; Capt. 1027; Cas.
422; and frequently; Asin. 588, auscultemus; 731, rem eloquamur;
Capt. 213, concedamus; Epid. 256, reperiamus; Men. 349, videamus;
And. 171, eamus; so also H. T. 432; Eun. 377; and frequently; Eun.
442, mittamus; 609, properemus; Hec. 622, accedamus; 778, experia-
mur; Enn. Ann. 143, 5, virtute experiamur; Lucil. 166, precemur;
732, surgamus, eamus, agamus. There are some 115 other examples
of this usage in Early Latin.

Negative.

Poen. 251, ne eloquamur; Scipio, in Gell. iv, 18, 3 (Or. Frag. ed.
Meyer, p. 110), non igitur simus ingrati; Enn. Ann. 143, 2, nec cau-
ponantes bellum sed belligerantes, ferro non auro vitam cernamus.
The last two examples illustrate the freedom which prevailed in the
employment of negatives with volitive expressions. While *ne (neve)*
were volitive negatives, yet *non* and *neque* were always possible at
every period of the language. See below under the Prohibitive.

FIRST SINGULAR HORTATORY.

Here belongs Bacch. 1049, quod perdundumst properem perdere.
This is properly a self-exhortation. It corresponds exactly to Eun.
609, properemus.

THE PROHIBITIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.[1]

The prohibitive subjunctive covers independent sentences intro-
duced by *ne* expressing a prohibition. Both the present and perfect
tenses are employed in this use. For the difference in their force,
see below. Prohibitions may be in either the second or third per-
son,[2] and either singular or plural, though in the perfect tense any-

[1] Schmerl, Der Prohibitiv bei Plautus, 1886.
[2] Some scholars, e.g. Kühner, Ausf. Gramm. ii, p. 141 ff., and Elmer, Amer. Jour.
Phil. xv, p. 132 ff., have restricted the application of the term "prohibitive" to the
2d person. But this has no advantages, and involves the separation of clearly re-
lated material.

thing except the 2d singular is rare. In Early Latin I have noted only two instances of the 3d person singular perfect, and only two of the 2d person plural. The 3d person plural of the perfect apparently does not occur at all.

While the negative of the prohibitive is normally *ne* (*ne quis, ne ullus, ne umquam*, etc.), yet we find with both present and perfect a number of prohibitives introduced by *non, nullus, nemo, numquam*. In a few cases we find *ni* taking the place of *ne* as introductory particle.

The connecting negative with the prohibitive is normally *neque* (*nec*). *Neve* (*neu*), ordinarily regarded as the normal connecting negative with the prohibitive, is relatively much less frequent. See the detailed statistics below.

In the following citations I have aimed to include only those subjunctives which are clearly independent. Thus most instances of *ne erres, ne censeas, ne frustra sis* seem to me dependent purpose clauses. Other clauses which certain scholars regard as independent, I take as substantive clauses. Expressions like Capt. 331 and Vid. 52, ne duis, I have brought under the category of the permissive use; see below, p. 175.

The Present Prohibitive.

Second Singular with *ne*.

I give the material in full: Amph. 924, irata ne sies; Asin. 469, molestus ne sis; so also Men. 250; Most. 74; 601; 771; 877; 886 a; Pseud. 118; 889; Epid. 723, ne attigas; so also Bacch. 445; Truc. 276; Capt. 186, ne postules; so also Most. 613; 1023; Rud. 941; 1012; 1385; Capt. 349, ne vereare; 393, istuc ne praecipias; 957, ne spem ponas; Aul. 241, ne doceas; 173, ne facias; 341, ne perdas; Curc. 183, ne occlamites; 213, ne rogites; so also Merc. 165; Curc. 539, ne facias aut censeas; 565, ne facias; 568, ne me territes; so also 713; Epid. 145, ne imbitas; 304, ne abitas; Men. 327, ne quo abeas; 502, odiosus ne sies; Merc. 322, ne ducas; 401, ne duas; 528, ne arbitrere; M. G. 1215, ne sis cupidus; 1280, ne illam excrucies; 1361, ne morere; 1363, ne me deseras; 1422, ne sis frustra; 1423, ne quid speres; Most. 215, ne suadeas; 624, ne censeas; 745, ne quid metuas; 812, ne videare; Poen. 1373, ne mirere; Pseud. 275, ne praedices; Rud. 992, ne feras; Stich. 320, ne cures; Trin. 267, ne

fuas; 370, ne prohibeas; And. 205, ne facias; 789, ne attigas; H. T. 745, ne quaeras; 939, ne vereare; Eun. 76, ne te adflictes; 212, ne patiare; 273, ne sis; 388, ne conferas; 786, ne metuas; 988, ne spectes; Phor. 419, actum ne agas; Pac. 131, ne expectes; Turp. 106, ne attigas; Stat. 22, ne reare; Naev. Com. 5, ne dicas; Cist. 235, ne tu exponas; Enn. Sat. 481, ne expectes; Cato, Agr. 37, 3, ne tangas; 61, ne ares.

Most of the foregoing prohibitions are addressed to a definite 2d person. The last three examples along with Phor. 419 are general prohibitions.

Second Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ni.*

Epid. 339, ni quid tibi in spem ponas.

Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ne.*

Asin. 769, ad ne quem oculos adiciat; 762, ne epistula ulla sit in aedibus; 773, ne sapiat; 778, ne quoi anulum det; 779, talos ne quoiquam admoveat; 780, ne dicat; 785, ne quid commoveat; 794, ne tussiat; 797, ne faciat; Poen. 17, ne quis sedeat; 37, ne palma detur quoiquam; Pseud. 1267, ne quis me roget; H. T. 30, ne existumet; 361, ne quid titubet; Eun. 14, ne frustretur se aut sic cogitet; 529, molesta ne siet; 963, ne quam vim fieri sinat; Acc. 217, ne quisquam accumbat aut vescatur; Com. Incert. 30, ne pudeat; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, ne siet; so also 5, 2 (bis); 89; 143; 161, 4; 5, 2, ne sinat; ne quo eat; ne algeat; ne esuriat; ne censeat; 5, 3, ne faciat; 5, 4, ne quem habeat; ne quid velit; ne defrudet; ne habeat, ne quid velit; 66, 1, ne utatur; 83, ne adsit; 144, 4, ne quis concedat; 150, 2, ne promittat; 157, 12, ne cenet; Lucil. 797, ne sciat.

Third Singular (Present Prohibitive) with *ni.*

Cato, Agr. 143, rem divinam ni faciat; CIL, i, 198, 39, ioudex neiquis disputet; 199, 6, is ager vectigal nei sit; 40, ni quis sicet.

Second Plural Present Prohibitive.

Amph. 87, ne miremini; so Bacch. 1072; 116, ne admiremini; Bacch. 758, ne quoquam exsurgatis; Capt. 58, ne vereamini; Cist. 782, ne exspectetis; so Cas. 64; Pseud. 1234; Trin. 16; Truc. 482; M. G. 1378, ne me moneatis; Most. 468, ne attigatis; Pers. 93, ne detis; And. 980, ne exspectetis; so also Ad. 22; CIL, i, 34, 7, ne quairatis.

Third Plural Present Prohibitive.

Poen. 23, ne obsideant; Eun. 183, ne fiant; Cato, Agr. 67, 1, ne caedant.

Present Prohibitive Introduced by *numquam, nemo, nullus, non,* etc.

numquam: Amph. 672, numquam creduis.

nemo: Asin. 756, intro mittat neminem; 768, vocet neminem; Liv. And. Trag. 8, nemo haec ruminetur; Enn. Epigramm. 509, nemo me dacrumis decoret; Cato, Agr. 5, 3, credat nemini.

non: And. 787, non credas (*credes*, DP); Plaut. Frag. 147, non hoc pulveret.

ne . . . quidem: Hec. 342, ne mittas quidem quemquam.

Present Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives (*neve, neu, nive; neque, nec*).

neve, neu: Most. 403, (cave siveris) neu quisquam responset; Poen. 18, (ne quis sedeat) neu muttiant, neu obambulet, neu ducat; 29, neu adferat; 38, (ne palma detur) neve (*nive* C) extrudantur; Truc. 787, divorsae state, neve inter vos significetis; Cato, Agr. 5, 4, (ne quid velit) neu velit; 83, (ne adsit) neve videat; 143, 1, (rem divinam ni faciat) neve mandet; ibid. (quam minimum utatur) neve domum recipiat; ad cenam ne quo eat neve ambulatrix siet; CIL, i, 199, 40, (ni quis sicet) nive pascat nive fruatur.

neque, nec: Amph. 985, nec quisquam, tam audax fuat; Asin. 775, (suspiciones segreget) neque pedem premat; 777, neque det manum; 778, spectandum ne quoi anulum det neque roget; 784, (tibi dicat) neque nutet; 792, (ne quid commoveat, 785) neque faciat neque sciat; 799, (ne faciat) nec accedat nec dicat; 854, neque divini neque humani quicquam accreduas; Bacch. 476, ipsus neque amat nec tu creduas; Capt. 605, neque creduis; Men. 221, neque defiat neque supersit; And. 205, (ne facias) neque tu haud[1] dicas; Eun. 77, (ne te adflictes) neque addas; 1080, (fatuos est) neque istum metuas; Naev. Com. 112, linguis faveant nec subserviant.

For a discussion of the significance of the use of negatives with the prohibitive, and for a different interpretation given by Elmer to passages introduced by *neque*, see below.

---

[1] *Haud* is here pleonastic. The Mss. here give either *hoc dicas* or *hoc dices. Haud dicas* is Donatus's reading.

THE PERFECT PROHIBITIVE.

As already noted, the perfect use is restricted almost entirely to the second singular.

With *ne*.

Asin. 839, ne dixis; ne sic fueris; Aul. 744, ne istuc dixis; Cist. 110, ne quid quod illi doleat dixeris; Curc. 599, ne parasitum amiseris; Epid. 148, ne feceris; so also Men. 415; M. G. 283, ne dixis; 1333, ne interveneris; Most. 1097, ne occupassis; 1115, ne faxis; Pers. 572, ne parseris; 793, ne attigeris; Poen. 553, ne curassis; 993, ne parseris; Pseud. 79, ne parsis; Rud. 1155, ne ostenderis; Trin. 704, ne animum induxeris; 1012, ne destiteris currere; Truc. 606, ne responsis; Phor. 742, ne me appellassis; Acc. 279, ne attenderis; Cato, Agr. 4, ne siveris; so also 113, 2; 37, 1, ne indideris; 45, 2, ne feceris; 93, ne addideris; so also 158, 2; 161, 2, ne sarueris.

The second plural appears in M. G. 862, ne dixeritis; the 3d singular in Phor. 554, ne quid faxit.

Perfect Prohibitive Introduced by *nullus, numquam, nil, nemo,* etc.

nullus: Hec. 79, nullus dixeris.

numquam: Capt. 149, numquam istuc dixis; fetial formula in Livy, i, 32, 7, numquam siris.

nil: Curc. 384, nil me monueris; M. G. 1007, nihil amassis; Most. 526, nil me curassis; so also Pseud. 232.

nemo : Cato, Agr. 5, 3, dederit nemini.

minime: Most. 272, minime feceris.

Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 166, notes that 2d singulars in -*sis* occur only in the prohibitive use.

Perfect Prohibitive with Connecting Negatives, *neve, neu, neque, nec.*

neve, neu: Merc. 401, (ne duas) neu dixeris; Pac. 200, neu, quaeso, siris.

neque, nec: Capt. 149, (numquam dixis) neque animum induxis; Rud. 1028, (abi tacitus) nec me quoiquam indicassis; Stich. 149, neque ego te celabo nec tu me celassis; Trin. 627, noli avorsari neque te occultassis; And. 392, nec minueris; H. T. 975, (ne te

admisce) nec tu aram nec precatorem pararis; Lucil. 775, neque barbam inmiseris istam; Enn. Epigramm. 509, (nemo me dacrumis decoret) nec funera fletu faxit; Ann. 143, (nec mi aurum posco) nec mi pretium dederitis. — *Et ne:* Cato, Agr. 113, 2.

On the Use of Negatives in the Prohibitive.[1]

In all original volitive uses, the regular negative in Latin is *ne*. This is not an Indo-European inheritance. In Indo-European the negative was *ně*, which was also the regular particle with the sub-junctive in its future use, as well as with the optative in all its functions (wishing, prescriptive, potential). There was, however, an Indo-European negative *mē*, which was peculiar to the so-called "injunctive." This injunctive consisted of forms which were outwardly identical with unaugmented praeterite indicatives. In function, this injunctive with its accompanying negative *mē* was equivalent to a negative imperative, or prohibitive. In Sanskrit we find these injunctives somewhat frequently with *mā* (= I. E. *mē*). But all subjunctives and optatives in Sanskrit regularly took *nă* (I. E. *ně*); i.e. Sanskrit maintained the Indo-European usage. In Greek, after the analogy of the injunctive with μή (*mē*), the volitive subjunctive and likewise the wishing and prescriptive optative came to take μή, while the other subjunctive and optative uses (the pure future and the potential) abandoned *ně* for an entirely different particle, viz. οὐ.

In Latin, the injunctive particle *mē* gained no foothold. Instead, we have a new particle *nē*, as the regular negative of the imperative, the volitive, and the optative subjunctive. In a few cases we have *ni* (*nei*), which is employed with independent subjunctives and opta-tives (also imperatives) precisely like *nē*, though it is much less fre-quently used and is confined almost exclusively to the early period.

As regards connecting negatives, Early Latin shows both *neve* (*neu*) and *neque* (*nec*), but the latter is far commoner, occurring 26 times as against 10 instances of the former. Barring Poen. 29, *neve*

---

[1] Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 388 ff. ; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 113 ff. ; 152 ff. ; 176 ff. ; 232 ff. ; Riemann et Goelzer, Grammaire Comparée, ii, p. 325 ff. ; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 579 ff. ; Schmalz, Lat. Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 480 ; Fowler, The Negatives of the Indo-European Languages, 1896 ; Elmer, Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 299 ff.

is used only when the preceding clause is prohibitive, and even then *neque* may be used (Seyffert, Bursian's Jahresbericht, 63, p. 37). *Neque* with volitive and optative subjunctives is probably a survival of the Indo-European use of *nĕ* with the subjunctive and optative. At all events, with the perfect, the usage seems to have been Italic; for it occurs in Oscan, where *nep* (= *neque*) is repeatedly combined with the perfect subjunctive in prohibitions; see Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, § 313. *Neque* occurs also with the imperative, even in Early Latin, e.g. CIL, xi, 4766, ne quis violatod neque exvehito neque exferto.

In Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 299 ff., Elmer denies the prohibitive character of all the above examples introduced by *neque (nec)*, *nullus*, *nemo*, *nil*, *numquam*, assuming that *ne* was the only possible negative with the prohibitive subjunctive. But this attitude is quite unnecessary, and postulates too great uniformity of usage for language in general. The examples with *neque*, *nemo*, *nullus*, etc., Elmer regarded as "subjunctives of obligation and propriety," referring the idiom to a potential origin. But the possibility of such a development of meaning was not made clear, and Elmer's theory involved forced and unnatural interpretations for the passages included under it. For a detailed criticism of Elmer's position, see Bennett, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, ix, p. 1 ff. A rejoinder was published by Elmer in Amer. Jour. Phil. xxi, p. 80 ff. But cf. Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat Spr. iii, 1, p. 197.

On the Force of Tenses in the Prohibitive.[1]

In the American Journal of Philology, xv, p. 132 ff., Elmer subjected to fresh criticism the force of tenses in the Latin prohibitive, and reached the conclusion that the old distinction drawn by Madvig would not hold. Madvig's theory was that in the second singular the perfect prohibitive was addressed to a definite second person, while the present was indefinite. Elmer showed that this theory will not hold for any period of the language or for any author. For Early Latin the proof was not necessary, as every play abounds in prohibitives addressed to a definite second person. In fact this represents the prevailing usage.

[1] See especially Elmer, Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 133 ff.; 299 ff.; Bennett, Cornell, Studies in Classical Philology, ix, p. 48 ff.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, 1, p. 197; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 376 ff.

But the positive doctrine which Elmer endeavored to set up in place of the Madvigian view is quite as untenable. It was this: The present is used of ordinary prohibitions, the perfect where there is special emotion or excitement. Later (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxi, p. 84), this theory was modified somewhat, and the perfect was explained as the tense employed when "non-compliance with the prohibition would be shocking or disastrous." But the whole theory, as is obvious, is highly subjective, and has met with but slight favor. On the other hand it has met with much criticism, not only as a general doctrine, but as applied to authors and periods.[1] Elmer restricted the term 'prohibitive' to forms of the second person accompanied by *ne*, ruling out all third persons and all prohibitions with *neque, nil, nemo, nullus, numquam*, etc. But even in this restricted application of the term he has not succeeded in establishing his doctrine.

Delbrück's theory (Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 375 ff.) is that the present prohibitive is durative ('durativ'), the perfect aoristic ('momentan'); i.e. the present represents the act as in process, while the perfect represents it without reference to continuance or completion. While this is in accord with the undoubtedly original force of the two tenses, yet I cannot agree with either Delbrück or Blase (Hist. Gramm. iii, p. 197) that the instances from Early Latin conform entirely to this principle. It is generally true that the perfect prohibitive preserves its original aoristic force; but many presents are also aoristic and do not emphasize the act as in process. Any one, with the above material, can easily make the test for himself.

DEVELOPMENTS OF THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

There are several very natural developments of the jussive and prohibitive. Thus a command may amount to an expression of consent or permission ('Permissive Subjunctive'), of easy acquiescence ('Subjunctive of Acquiescence'), or of defiance, etc.

THE PERMISSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

This occurs in both the present and perfect tenses, though sparingly in the latter. The force varies from pure permission to indifference. Where the indifference becomes extreme, the subjunctive

[1] Cf. Lebreton, Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron, 1901, p. 294 ff.; Clement, Classical Review, xv, p. 157 ff.

sometimes expresses defiance (e.g. Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt; Hec. 634, turbent porro quam velint). The special force of the mood is often emphasized by the addition of a clause of proviso, or a relative clause with *libet*, by the presence of *vel, mea caussa*, or some such expression. See the examples. In a few instances we find negative permissives. The negative particle with these is *ne*.

THE PRESENT PERMISSIVE.

Affirmative.

Amph. 558, proinde ut lubet quidque facias; 644, absit, dum modo domum recipiat se; 928, tibi habeas res tuas; Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt (defiance); Capt. 693, vel te interisse praedicent; Cist. 493, habeas; Curc. 180, dum abstineant, sibi quisque habeant; Epid. 679, dum sine me quaeras, quaeras mea caussa vel medio in mari; Merc. 989, sibi habeat; so also Pers. 164; Rud. 1121; Merc. 991, supplici sibi sumat quod volt; Most. 46, tu tibi istos habeas turtures; 772, inspiciat si libet; Pers. 352, ferant; 373, dicat quod quisque volt; Rud. 727, habeat, si argentum dabit; 1165, sit per me quidem; 1369, habeas tibi; so also Stich. 615; Trin. 979, dum ne sis quem nolo, sis mea caussa qui lubet; Truc. 736, discant, dum mihi liceat; And. 889, habeat, valeat, vivat; 895, age, dicat: sino; H. T. 464, faciat quid lubet; Phor. 341, tu rideas, prior bibas; prior decumbas; Hec. 634, turbent porro quam velint; Ad. 134, profundat, perdat, pereat; nil ad me attinet; 622, valeas, habeas; 996, sino: habeat; Acc. 203, oderint, dum metuant; Naev. Com. 130, dum videat, sciat; Stat. 11, mutuet mea caussa; Afran. 120, iactabit sese; iactet; 408, dum modo doleat aliquid, doleat quid lubet.

Negative.

In the affirmative examples of the permissive subjunctive the force was, 'you may, if you want,' 'he may, for all I care,' etc. In the negative examples, the idea is, 'you needn't, unless you want,' etc. Examples: Asin. 460, ne duit, si non volt, 'he needn't give, unless he wishes;' Aul. 238, ne duas; 241, novi; ne doceas; Epid. 584, ne fuat, si non volt; Pers. 851, ne sit; Rud. 1367, mihi triobolum ne duis; Trin. 606, nullus creduas; Vid. 52, ne duis. — With connecting negative (*neque*), Vid. 51, nec mihi nisi unum prandium quicquam duis.

THE PERFECT PERMISSIVE.

Of the five instances I have noted, four are negative: Bacch. 90, tu nullus adfueris, si non lubet; Epid. 595, ne fueris pater; Rud. 1135, nullum ostenderis; And. 892, viceris, 'have your way;'[1] Phor. 514, unam horam ne oppertus sies.

These examples show no noticeable difference of force between the present and perfect in the permissive use.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF COMPLIANCE.[2]

Closely related to the previous category, but logically distinct from it, is the subjunctive of compliance. For the most part it is confined to a few formulaic expressions, such as *fiat, mos tibi geratur,* etc.: Amph. 770, fiat ('very well'). The same expression occurs also, Asin. 40; Aul. 241; Capt. 213; 966; Curc. 673; Men. 544; Most. 803; 1038; Pseud. 559; Rud. 1037; 1042; 1337; 1417; 1423; Stich. 565; Truc. 962; Asin. 671, fricentur; Bacch. 537, cena detur, i.e. 'I'll agree to give you a dinner;' so also Truc. 127; cf. the familiar cena tibi dabitur; Pseud. 559, geratur mos tibi; so also Asin. 40; Truc. 961, utrique mos geratur; And. 956, age fiat; so also H. T. 790; 948; 1067; Eun. 100; 500; 614; Phor. 811; 1054; Hec. 358; Ad. 201; 521; 945; H. T. 743, eatur; 790, quaeratur aliquid; Eun. 1068, audiamus.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF UNFULFILLED PAST OBLIGATION.[3]

Just as the present jussive *dicat* means 'let him say,' 'he is to say,' so, by a perfectly natural extension, the past jussive came to mean, 'he ought to have said.' This may be made clearer by the following English illustration. If I wish a hackman to take me to the station at seven o'clock, I say to him, 'You are to come to-morrow at seven o'clock' (*venias cras septima hora*). When he fails to come, I reprove him for his negligence, saying, 'You were to come at seven," i.e. 'You ought to have come at seven' (*venires septima hora*). The context indicates clearly enough that the past obligation was unfulfilled. We thus get a new idiom, which is of somewhat frequent

---

[1] Ordinarily taken as future perfect; so Fairclough and Ashmore, ad loc.; but see Sjögren, Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, p. 155.

[2] Cf. Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, § 531, 1.

[3] Blase, Hist. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 152.

occurrence. In a few instances we have negative expressions of this kind. In accordance with their volitive origin, the negative in these is regularly *ne*, though *non* is found in one passage discussed below. In Cicero we find also the pluperfect tense in this idiom, — evidently an attempt to bring out with greater distinctness the reference to past time. But in Early Latin we find only the imperfect.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Merc. 633 (quid ego facerem? :: quid tu faceres? men rogas?) requireres, rogitares; 636, ubi habitaret invenires; 637, exquireres; M. G. 731, vitam ei longinquam darent; 732, is adimerent animam cito; Pers. 710, cras ires potius, hodie hic cenares; Poen. 387, sic enim diceres; 391, ea memorares; Pseud. 286, invenires mutuom, ad danistam devenires, adderes faenusculum, surruperes patri; 288, surruperet patri? Rud. 379, adservaret, in custodia esset; 842, caperes fustem; Truc. 748, auferres domum; And. 793, praediceres; H. T. 533, aliquid reperiret, fingeret fallacias, atque servaret senem; Phor. 297, dotem daretis, quaereret alium virum; 299, sumeret alicunde; 468, illi consuleres; Hec. 230, curares.

NEGATIVE.

Men. 611, ne clam me comesses prandium; Pseud. 437, tu ne faceres tale; Trin. 133, non redderes, neque de illo quicquam neque emeres neque redderes neque faceres copiam; Lucil. 498, at enim dicis: 'neu muttires quicquam neu mysteria ecferres foras.'

We should naturally have expected *ne* in the third example, and the connective *neve* (*neu*). But immediately preceding we have *non redderem ?* a normal form of a past deliberative inquiry of duty or fitness (see below, p. 182). It is this *non redderem*, apparently, which has changed a normal *ne redderes* to *non redderes*, the speaker purposely following in his answer the form of the previous inquiry. With *non*, of course, *neque* (and not *neve*) naturally followed.

It is worthy of note that most of the instances of this idiom are in the second person. This is entirely natural, for the second person present (on which this idiom is modelled) must have been much commoner in daily speech than the third; and it is the positive frequency of a usage which naturally leads to its extension beyond its natural boundaries.

THE JUSSIVE AS PROTASIS.

I have noted few instances of this: Trin. 441, hic postulet frugi esse: nugas postulet; H. T. 643, melius peius, prosit obsit, nil vident, nisi quod lubet; Lucil. 371, visuri sint alieni viri, spiras pallam redimicula promit; Cato, Agr. 157, 4, in ea volnera teras brassicam; sanum faciet; 157, 14, in fistulam introeat; ea res sanum faciet. Pseud. 1015, argentum des, abducas mulierem, hardly seems to me to belong here.

THE PROHIBITIVE SUBJUNCTIVE IN INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

Here belongs Merc. 60, ne luberet vivere, which is simply *ne lubeat*, projected into the past.

THE CONCESSIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

A natural development of the jussive and prohibitive uses is the concessive subjunctive, with the force, 'I grant that.' This is a fairly frequent idiom in the classical Latinity. In Early Latin I have noted only the following example, from Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 25, 4, sane sint superbi: quid id ad nos adtinet?

THE "DELIBERATIVE" SUBJUNCTIVE.[1]

Under this head are generally brought several classes of subjunctive uses which, though related in origin, are nevertheless logically very distinct from one another.   Thus:

a) Bacch. 406, sequere : : quo sequar? 'where do you bid me, or advise me, to follow?'

b) Eun. 523, haec quor quaeritet? 'why should he ask this?' Epid. 588, non patrem te nominem? ('am I not to call you father?')

c) Bacch. 634, quid faciam? (soliloquizing, self-interrogatory), 'what course shall I pursue?'

d) Eun. 822, quid ego dicam misera? 'dear me! What can I say!' implying that the speaker is in a condition where the proposed action is hopelessly impossible.

These four types [2] are seldom differentiated.   Usually they are all

[1] Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im Altlateinischen, 1904, p. 81 ff.; Morris, On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence, Am. Jour. Phil. x, 397 ff.; xi, 16 ff.; Subjunctive in Independent Sentences in Plautus, Am. Jour. Phil. xviii, 133 ff.

[2] Repudiating Questions are given separate treatment.

brought roughly under the one head of the "Deliberative." For convenience I shall designate them respectively as follows:

 a) Subjunctive of Inquiry after a Command or Advice.
 b) Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness.
 c) True Deliberatives.
 d) Subjunctive of Impossibility or Helplessness.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF INQUIRY AFTER A COMMAND[1] OR ADVICE.

This seems to be the original type of the four categories above mentioned, and is clearly of volitive origin, as may be seen from the fact that in many cases the inquiry after a command is preceded by an imperative or a jussive subjunctive. Examples: Aul. 638, pone hoc : : quid ponam ? 651, redde huc : : quid reddam ? Bacch. 44, id caveas : : quid caveam ? 75, simulato : : utrum ioco adsimulem an serio ? 406, sequere : : quo sequar? 731, scribe : : quid scribam? Further examples are: Aul. 644; Capt. 839; 843; Curc. 599; 721; Men. 618; Merc. 565; 749; M. G. 363; 459; Most. 513; 579; Poen. 357; Pseud. 1184; 1326; Rud. 938; Trin. 968; 981; Truc. 789; H. T. 585, quid faciam ? : : iube hunc abire : : quo ego abeam ? Phor. 540; Hec. 715.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

The previous section has dealt with the subjunctive of inquiry after a command. A new logical category arises when the inquiry after a command implies by the tone or mental attitude of the speaker that he recognizes the superior authority, wisdom, or judgment of the person addressed and wishes to follow his directions. ' What do you tell me to do ? ' then becomes ' What should I do ? ' ' What ought I to do ? ' In a number of instances we have a preceding imperative, just as in the case of the previous category, e.g. Amph. 783, exsolve cistulam : : quid ego istam exsolvam ? M. G. 318, non iubes ? (= *iube*) : : quam ob rem iubeam ? Pseud. 1294, i in malam crucem : : cur ego adflicter? Many of these questions are, of course, purely rhetorical, — the inquiry, ' Ought I to do this ? ' ' Am I to do this ? ' often implying, ' I ought not to do this.'

In accordance with their origin, these questions of duty and fitness

[1] Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, 1891, p. 8; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288.

are usually in the first person, for they arise from inquiries after a command. Such commands are commonly in the second person; hence the inquiry is naturally in the first. The second and third persons, however, are occasionally found. The second person in the few instances in which it occurs does not differ logically from the first. In the third person the meaning often is: 'Is it right that he should do' or 'be?' 'Is it natural that he should do' or 'be?' e.g. H. T. 129, mea solius solliciti sint causa? ancillae tot me vesti-ant? 'Is it right that they should be bothered?' M. G. 925, qui noverit me? 'How is he likely to know me?' Pers. 636, quae (patria) mihi sit, nisi haec? 'What is it natural' or 'likely to be except this?'

The question may be introduced by the usual interrogative pro-nouns and adverbs (*quis, quid, cur, quam ob rem, ubi, quo, qui, unde*), by *utrum, an, -ne*, or there may be no introductory particle at all.

While the idiom originated in the present tense, yet it was also extended to the imperfect; see the examples below.

Negative questions of duty or fitness are also frequent. They present a variety of formal types, which will be considered in their proper place.

In a number of instances it is difficult to decide whether a given form is to be regarded as present subjunctive or future indicative, for the future indicative may be used with the same logical force as the subjunctive of duty or fitness.

Whether some of the examples brought under this head are not to be referred to a potential origin, is a question that has been often raised. Delbrück (Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 389), Elmer (Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 299 ff.; Cornell Studies, vi, p. 213 ff.), along with several earlier scholars, answer this question in the affirmative, particularly for certain types of negative questions of duty or fitness. Elmer's view will be considered below. So far as affirmative questions of duty or fitness are concerned, the potential origin is possible for only a small fraction of the material in Early Latin; it is not nec-essary for any of it. Asin. 724, quid exoptem? Stich. 294, an vero nugas censeas? And. 529, quid malim? 962, quem potissimum optem? Phor. 827, ubinam invenire possim? represent about all the questions of this kind in Early Latin where a potential character

could be easily defended. But if these are questions of duty and fitness, it seems much more probable that they are developments — extreme perhaps — of the volitive use.

AFFIRMATIVE QUESTIONS OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

Present Tense.

a) Introduced by Interrogative Pronouns or Adverbs: Amph. 41, quid ego memorem? Asin. 47, cur quaeram aut cur miniter? 267, ubi Libanum requiram? 716, quem te nominem? Aul. 713, quo curram? Capt. 739, cur postulem? Most. 581, quid ego recursem aut operam sumam aut conteram? Pers. 531, quam ob rem argentum enumerem? Poen. 386, quo modo orem? Pseud. 966, unde dicam? And. 343, ubi quaeram? quo intendam? 499, quid credas? H. T. 32, quor insano serviat? Eun. 523, haec quor quaeritet? Phor. 534, unde argentum inveniam? 1022, qui sperem? Enn. Trag. 298, quemnam te esse dicam? Acc. 295, cur pigrem aut dubitem? Turp. 120, quid te appellem? Gracchus (Meyer), p. 239, quo me conferam? quo me vertam? Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 27, 6, ecquis me augurem capiat? I have noted 81 further examples of this use in Early Latin.

b) No Introductory Particle: Asin. 489, tu contumeliam facias? 'are you to indulge in abuse?' 838, putem? Bacch. 903, exigam aurum? Pers. 26, cum eis belligerem? Stich. 297, nunc ultro deportem? H. T. 414, celem gaudium? Phor. 186, taceam? purgem me? 813, illa maneat? 973, venias nunc precibus? Cf. also H. T. 129, cited above, p. 180.

c) Introduced by *utrum, an, -ne:* Pers. 26, eisne advorser? Stich. 294, an vero nugas censeas? Eun. 721, utrum praedicemne an taceam? Hec. 442, maneamne? Ad. 128, an ego audiam? 336, patiamurne an narremus? Acc. 488; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 27, 5; Hec. 849; 852. Merc. 128 may be fut. ind.

Imperfect Tense.

This is simply the present projected into the past: Merc. 633, quid ego facerem? : : (requireres); Rud. 379, quid faceret? : : (adservaret dies noctesque); H. T. 532, quid faceret? : : (aliquid reperiret, fingeret fallacias); Trin. 177, an ego paterer? 178, eius essetne ea pecunia? 'Was it fitting that the money should become his?' 957, mihi

concrederet, ' Was he likely to intrust it to me ? ' H. T. 202, quem
ferret ? ' Whom was he to be expected to put up with? ' Eun. 604, an
ego occasionem amitterem ? ' Was I likely to let the chance pass ? '

Perfect Tense.

Merc. 301, ausimne eloqui?   The perfect here has aoristic force.

NEGATIVE QUESTIONS OF DUTY OR FITNESS.

In logical value these correspond in the main to the affirmative
questions already considered.   Both tenses occur, the present and
imperfect.   The negative is usually *ni*,[1] a volitive negative found
with the prohibitive (see p. 169), in purpose clauses, and with other
subjunctives of volitive origin.   We should naturally expect *ne*, but
ni is by origin quite as much volitive in character as *ne*.   Less fre-
quently than *ni*, we find *non*.   This last usage is probably to be
accounted for by the fact that with affirmative questions of duty
and fitness the Roman mind had come in course of time to feel no
longer their volitive character.   They were conceived of simply as
questions of duty and fitness, — no longer as inquiries after direc-
tions or instructions.   Hence *non* came to be used.   In the classical
period, *non* has entirely usurped the place of the earlier volitive *ni*.
This use of *non* as the regular negative in expressions of this sort in
the classical period, and its occasional use also in the earlier period,
led Elmer (Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, p. 314 ff.; Cornell Studies, vi,
213 ff.) to deny their volitive origin and to endeavor to explain them
as potential developments.   But it is not easy to see how *cur non
laeter*, for example, as a potential expression meaning, ' Why would
I not rejoice (if so and so should happen) ? ' could come to mean,
' Why should (ought) I not rejoice ? '   The fact that English
' should ' (' ought ') has developed into the ' should ' of contingent
futurity (' I should think,' etc.) might support the same develop-
ment for Latin; but it cannot fairly be used as an argument in sup-
port of the *reverse* semasiological development, as Elmer seeks to
employ it.   Moreover his theory assumes absolute regularity of
linguistic development and allows no scope for that inevitable

[1] This type corresponds, therefore, exactly to Greek deliberatives introduced
by μή.

breaking away from strict schematic conformity which character-
izes living speech. See Bennett, Cornell Studies, vi, p. 1 ff.

Besides *non* and *ni*, we find also various other negatives, e.g. *qui
minus, quin, ne . . . quidem, nonne,* and *nil.*

Present Tense.

a) Introduced by *quid . . . ni* or *quid ni:* Amph. 434, quid ego
ni negem? Curc. 423, quid ni noverim? 'Why am I not to be
supposed to know?' So also M. G. 923; Men. 912, quid ni sentiam?
M. G. 554, quid ni (quid nunc, *A*) fateare? 1120, quid ego ni ita
censeam? 1311, quid ego ni fleam? So also Pseud. 96; 652, quid
ego ni teneam? Stich. 333, quid ni rogitem? H. T. 529, quid ego
ni sciam? Eun. 674, quid ni habeam? Ad. 573, quid ni noverim?
662, quid illam ni abducat? 726, quid ni patiar?

b) With *non:* Asin. 489, tibi non dicatur? Epid. 588, non patrem
te nominem? And. 921, non tu feras? H. T. 583, non accedam?
Hec. 341, non visam? Lucil. 551, non appellem?

The foregoing examples have *non* alone. The following have *non*
in combination with another particle: Aul. 713, quo non curram?
M. G. 317, cur non rogem? Most. 209, cur non curem? Curc. 10,
egon non feram? Phor. 260, egon illi non suscenseam?

c) With *quin.* The only example of this category ordinarily
reckoned here is M. G. 426, quin rogem? But with equal confidence
I should recognize also the following: Eun. 811, quin redeamus?
(taken as "deliberative" by Sjögren, Zum Gebrauch des Futurums im
Altlateinischen, p. 77); Phor. 1015, sed ea quin sit ignoscenda?
Lucil. 336, quin potius vitam degas quietam? may also belong here.[1]

d) With *qui minus:* Amph. 76, qui minus eadem histrioni sit lex
quae summo viro? 986, mihi qui minus liceat? Merc. 825, qui minus
contentus sit?

e) Other forms: Hec. 811, nil aliud dicam? Phor. 412, an ne hoc
quidem adipiscar? Pacuv. 129, nonne officium fungar volgi?

Imperfect Tense.

Curc. 552, nonne is crederem? The use of *nonne* in questions of
this type, if not absolutely unknown in the later language, is at all

---

[1] Morgan also, Addresses and Essays, p. 137 f., recognizes the Terentian and
Lucilian passages as illustrating the deliberative with *quin.*

events exceedingly rare. Other examples: Trin. 133, non ego illi
argentum redderem ? Most. 454, cur non tangerem ? Eun. 481, quid
ni esset ? Lucil. 463, quid nei illitteratum me diceres ?

TRUE DELIBERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVES.[1]

The number of subjunctives that can with accuracy be called
deliberative is exceedingly small. Most of those subjunctives ordi-
narily designated as deliberative have nothing deliberative about
them, but are more properly classified under the two preceding
categories or under the following one. The only uses to which the
term "deliberative" may fairly be applied are those in which the
speaker is represented as actually deliberating with himself as to
what course of action he shall pursue. Instances of this sort are
few. As examples may be cited: Curc. 589, quid ego faciam ?
maneam an abeam ? M. G. 305, quid ego nunc faciam ? So also
Merc. 712; Cist. 528, quid ego nunc agam ? So Most. 662; Trin.
718; And. 846; Ad. 784; And. 639, sed quid agam ? adeamne et
expostulem ? ingeram mala ? H. T. 674, quid agam ? aut quid com-
miniscar ? Ad. 625, nunc quid faciam, Asin. 258, unde sumam ?
quem intervortam ? quo hanc celocem conferam ? Capt. 531, quid
machiner ? quid comminiscar ? Cist. 641, utrum hac me feriam
an ab laeva ? And. 259, nunc quid primum exsequar ? 468, quod
remedium nunc inveniam ? So Phor. 200; Eun. 46, quid igitur
faciam ? non eam ? an me comparem . . . redeam? 966, quid
faciam ? quidve incipiam ? dicam an non dicam ? Ad. 625, dicam
fratris esse hanc ? Enn. Trag. 231, quo nunc me vortam ? quod iter
incipiam ?

Most of these cases seem fairly certain illustrations of the usage
under discussion. But I should not venture to add to the foregoing
examples. Most of them, it will be noted, contain the particles
nunc or *igitur*, both natural concomitants of a question of delibera-
tion; or else we have a double question, an equally natural sign of
deliberation. In one or two instances we have negative questions.
With these the negative is *non*.

In origin these deliberatives are very closely related to the fore-

[1] See Dräger, Hist. Synt. i, § 148, who takes this usage as potential; Kühner, Ausf.
Lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 2 ; Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, p. 5; Morris,
Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288.

going category of the subjunctive of duty and fitness. The question in the subjunctive of duty or fitness is addressed to some one else. In the true deliberatives it is addressed to oneself.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF IMPOSSIBILITY OR HELPLESSNESS.

The subjunctive of duty or fitness often develops by a perfectly natural process into a question or exclamation implying impossibility or helplessness; i.e. *quid faciam,* for example, from meaning, 'What should I do ?' comes as a result of the context to mean, 'What *can* I do ?' in the sense of, 'I can do nothing.' The usage occurs mainly in the present tense and in the 1st person, but instances of the imperfect and perfect occasionally occur. Sometimes too we find the 2d person. From the nature of the case there are no negative subjunctives of this type.

It is not always easy, as it is not necessary, to draw a sharp line of division between subjunctives of duty or fitness, on the one hand, and subjunctives of impossibility or helplessness, on the other. Doubtless interpreters would differ in their understanding of numerous passages. This, however, is of small significance. That in a large number of cases the notion of impossibility or helplessness has developed, is sufficiently obvious, and the extent of the material coming under this head amply justifies the recognition of the category. As typical cases may be cited the following :

Present Tense.

Amph. 155, quid faciam ? So Merc. 207 ; Pers. 42. Often in the fuller form : quid ego nunc faciam ? as Cas. 549; Curc. 555; Men. 963 ; Amph. 1046, quid nunc agam ? So Aul. 274; Most. 378 ; Bacch. 630, unde habeam ? Capt. 208, quo fugiamus ? Rud. 204, quam spem capessam ? 653, quid illum porro praedicem ? Phor. 199, quid agam ? So 728 ; Hec. 444; Ad. 789, quid faciam ? quid agam ? Eun. 610, ubi mutem ? 822, quid ego dicam misera ? Phor. 185, quod remedium inveniam ? Ad. 256, quid ego nunc te laudem ? 528, quid dicam ? 614, quo modo me expediam ? Enn. Trag. 75, quid petam aut exsequar ? quove auxilio freta sim ? 77, quo accedam ? quo applicem ? Turp. 196, quid agam ?

The following are examples of the second person : H. T. 317, quid

illo facias? 642, quid agas? So Eun. 74; Ad. 433; Ad. 330, quid
credas? quoi credas? 431, quid facias?

The three following examples seem also to belong here, though
it is possible that they may be of potential origin: Asin. 506, ubi
piem Pietatem? Pseud. 1095, unde ea sit mihi? And. 613, qua
⟨auda⟩cia id facere audeam?

Imperfect Tense.

Here we have the natural projection of the present into the past,
as in previous related categories: Merc. 884, quid ibi faceres? The
Mss. have *qui tibi facer his* (facere vis, *B*); *faceres* is Lachmann's
conjecture. And. 53, qui scire posses? Eun. 831, quid facerem?
So Ad. 214; 691, qua resciscerem?

Perfect Tense.

This usage arises by an extension analogous to that already noted
under the imperfect. The perfect here functions as a true present
perfect: Amph. 748, ubi audiverim? 'Where am I to have heard
it?' 'Where am I to be supposed to have heard it?' i.e. 'I can't
have heard it.' Cas. 617, quid (quod, *Mss.;* quot, *Lindsay*) ego
inique fecerim? 'What wrong can I ever have done?' i.e. 'I can
never have done any such wrong.'

SUBJUNCTIVE IN REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.[1]

In these the speaker repudiates with scorn or indignation some
command or imputation, or expresses his disdain at some proposal
of another person. The origin of these repudiating questions or
exclamations is, I believe, to be found in passages like M. G. 496,
vicine ausculta:: ego auscultem tibi? The context shows that the
inquiry is uttered with contempt. The subjunctive in such cases
was the subjunctive of inquiry after a command, but the indignant
attitude of the speaker develops a repudiating force. As a result of

[1] Kraz, Sogenannte unwillige oder missbilligende Frage, 1862; Müller, G., Ueber
die sogenannten unwilligen oder misbilligenden Fragen, 1875; Schnoor, Zum Gebrauch
von *ut* bei Plautus, 1885, p. 3; Guthmann, Ueber eine Art unwilliger Fragen, 1891;
Dahl, Lat. Partikel VT, 1882, p. 298 ff.; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 288 ff.;
Dräger, Hist. Synt. ii, § 526; Kühner, Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 2; Dittmar, Studien
z. Lat. Moduslehre, 1897, p. 79 ff.

the frequency of such expressions, a new category was formed. As soon as it became firmly established, it naturally began to extend beyond its original limits, and as a result we find repudiating questions and exclamations where no vestige of an inquiry after a command is discernible or even conceivable, e.g. Capt. 207, fingitis fugam :: nos fugiamus! The idiom is even transferred to the past, e.g. Phor. 120, ille daret illi! Men. 678, pallam quam tibi dedi mihi redde :: . . . mihi tu dederis pallam!

Repudiating questions and exclamations may be used either with or without particles. The particles employed are *-ne, ut, -ne ut, utin.* Whether these particles are interrogative or merely strengthening, will be considered below.

Negative repudiating questions and exclamations also occur. The negative is regularly *non.* In a single instance we find *ni.* The connecting negative *neque* is also found once.

AFFIRMATIVE REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.

No Introductory Particle.

PRESENT TENSE.

Illustrations of origin: Aul. 81, intus serva :: ego intus servem! Asin. 91, me defraudato :: defrudem te ego! Bacch. 627, non taces? (= tace) :: taceam! Curc. 553, vale :: quid! valeam! Men. 1023, med emittas manu :: liberem te! Most. 618, iube obicere :: iubeam! 633, dic te daturum :: ego dicam dare! Pseud. 1226, Pseudolum mihi dedas :: Pseudolum ego dedam tibi! And. 649, habeas :: habeam! 894, audi :: ego audiam! Eun. 796, Pamphilam huc redde :: tibi illam reddat aut tu eam tangas! Phor. 987, non taces :: taceam! 1000, narra :: tibi narret!

Uses modelled on the preceding type. In these there is no inquiry, after a command: Amph. 813, vir ego tuos sim! Asin. 482, tibi supplicium detur! Aul. 45, tibi ego rationem reddam! Bacch. 1176, exores tu me! Cas. 114, tua illaec praeda sit! (est, *P*); 454, deosculere! Most. 896, tibi obtemperem! Pseud. 486, aps ted auferam! Asin. 812; 814; Merc. 575; Pseud. 318; 626; Stich. 471; Trin. 515; And. 619, tu rem restituas! 900, adducas! 915, hic vir sit bonus! Hec. 524, vir ego tuos sim! Eun. 676; Hec. 589; 671; Ad. 938;

Enn. Trag. 195, Helene redeat, virgo pereat! tua reconcilietur uxor,
mea necetur filia! 121, ego letum inimico deprecer! Afran. 161,
pistori nubat!

IMPERFECT TENSE.

The instances of the imperfect all represent derived uses of the
present projected into the past: And. 282, memor essem! Phor. 120,
ille daret illi! 382, nossem! Ad. 396, sinerem illum!

PERFECT TENSE.

Of the three instances of the perfect tense in this use, one is
aoristic and looks forward to the future, viz. Truc. 625, quid!
manu vicerim! The other two refer to the past: Most. 1026 d, ille
aedis emerit! Hec. 138, cum virgine una adulescens cubuerit, sese
illa abstinere ut potuerit!

Introduced by *-ne*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Illustrations of origin: Asin. 91, me defrudato : : ten ego defru-
dem! 696, meum collum circumplecte : : ten complectatur! Curc.
119, salve : : egon salva sim! Pers. 186, da pignus : : egon dem pig-
nus tecum! Pseud. 1315, onera : : egon istum onerem! 1327, mecum
i (*de conj.*) : : egone eam! And. 383, dic : : egon dicam! H. T. 1015,
confitere : : egon confitear! Eun. 152, nil respondes? (= responde) : :
egon quicquam tibi respondeam!

Uses modelled on the preceding type: Asin. 628, tun verberes! 669,
ten osculetur! 700, ten ego veham! tun hoc feras! 810, egon haec patiar
aut taceam! Aul. 756, tun habeas! 824, egon te emittam! Bacch.
1192; Cas. 111; Curc. 494; Epid. 518; 574; Men. 559; M. G. 686;
1276; Most. 301; Pers. 135; 295; Poen. 368; Pseud. 205 b; 290;
Stich. 132; Truc. 276; 312; 775; 925; And. 270, egon istuc conari
queam! 271, egon illam decipi sinam! 910, tun haec facias! 943,
egon patiar! Eun. 191, egon quid velim! 808; Phor. 431; Hec. 852;
Acc. 231, egone Argivom imperium attingam aut Pelopia digner
domo! Stat. 221, egon vitam meam contendam cum tua! 232; Lucil.
752.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Trin. 961, eine aurum crederem! And. 584, egon istuc facerem! Ad. 676, advorsumne illum causam dicerem!

PERFECT TENSE.

Amph. 818, tun mecum fueris! In this instance the reference is to the past. In the four following examples we have *ausim* used aoristically: Merc. 154, egon ausim proloqui! Most. 923, egon te ausim fallere! So 924; Poen. 149.

Whether -*ne* in the foregoing examples is the interrogative or asseverative particle, cannot be determined conclusively. Warren in Amer. Jour. Phil. ii, 50 ff., seems to have established the existence of an affirmative or asseverative -*ne*, and (p. 78 f.) recognizes it in expressions of the sort under discussion. Dahl (Lat. Partikel VT, p. 299 ff.) does the same, urging as a reason the greater force thus lent to the repudiation. But we can hardly regard this as final. I regard the question as still open, therefore.

Introduced by *ut*.

PRESENT TENSE.

Amph. 694, te ut deludam! Bacch. 375, ut celem patrem tua flagitia! Most. 14, comesse ut quisquam possit! Pers. 132, me ut quisquam norit! Poen. 316, ut quidem tu huius oculos tractes! Trin. 750, ut ego thesaurum indicem! And. 618, tibi ego ut credam! H. T. 1050, mea bona ut dem Bacchidi! Phor. 669, me ille ut inrideat! Ad. 654, virginem ut secum avehat! This may be simply an echo of the previous purpose clause, in v. 653.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

Enn. Trag. 227, ut ego illi supplicarem!

PERFECT TENSE.

Men. 683, mihi tu ut dederis pallam! Some take this as dependent on the following *numquam factum reperies*. But this is tame and quite unnecessary. Most. 1017, mecum ut ille gesserit! H. T. 954, ut pater eiecerit!

Ut in the foregoing examples is variously interpreted. Dahl (Lat.

Partikel VT, p. 301) confidently asserts that the *ut* here cannot be either the indefinite or the interrogative particle, and so proposes to explain expressions of this type as the result of ellipsis, supplying in sense *putasne fieri posse* or something of the sort. Morris, on the other hand ('Sentence Question,' Amer. Jour. Phil. xi, p. 176), says, "it is plain that *ut* is interrogative in these questions." Morris's view is the traditional, and probably, the prevailing one; yet I have never been able to accept it. Unless we abandon the volitive theory of these clauses, I am at a loss to see how *ut* can here be interrogative. And I cannot abandon the theory of their volitive origin in view of their logical and formal relationship to expressions like *ego intus servem! defrudem te ego!* It seems to me, therefore, much more probable that *ut* in these expressions is the indefinite, or strengthening, *ut*. I should therefore regard the *ut* in And. 618, tibi ego ut credam! as of precisely the same nature as in *mihi ut credas* ('Just believe me!'), i.e. in both cases as an asseverative or strengthening particle; cf. p. 165.

Introduced by -ne ut.

PRESENT TENSE.

Aul. 690, egon ut mentiar! Bacch. 375, egone ut haec gestem clanculum! 637, egone ut putem! 842, meamne ut retineat mulierem! Curc. 616, mean ancilla libera ut sit! Pseud. 516, egone ut cavere nequeam! Rud. 1244, egone ut celem! Trin. 378, egone indotatam te uxorem ut patiar! Truc. 758, egone ut haec mihi patiar fieri! And. 263, ein ego ut advorser! H. T. 784, egon ut ei despondeam! Eun. 771, hancine ego ut contumeliam accipiam! Phor. 304, egon illam ut patiar! 955, hicine ut tantum argentum auferat! 992, hicine ut tibi respondeat! Acc. 427, egone ut hosti me offeram!

IMPERFECT TENSE.

M. G. 962, egone ut auderem!

Introduced by *utin.*

Present Tense: Merc. 576, utine vomitum excutias mulieri! Rud. 1063, utine istic prius dicat! Hec. 199, utin omnes mulieres eadem studeant nolintque!

Imperfect: Phor. 874, utine haec ignoraret suom patrem!

Perfect: Epid. 225, utin impluvium induta fuerit!

NEGATIVE REPUDIATING QUESTIONS AND EXCLAMATIONS.

The negative here is *non,* to be explained in the same way as in connection with the subjunctive of duty and fitness (p. 179). There is also a single instance of *ni.* The same introductory particles are employed as in affirmative repudiating questions, viz. *-ne, ut, -ne ut, utin,* but these particles are not necessary. The imperfect tense occurs as well as the present.

No introductory particle: Phor. 419, ne agas : : non agam! Eun. 798, ego non tangam meam! Poen. 352, ego non (nunc, *codd.*) te curem! Rud. 723, mihi non liceat (licet, *codd.*) abducere! Truc. 443, ego isti non munus mittam! Hec. 342, non visas! — Imperfect Tense: Eun. 591, ego hoc homuncio non facerem!

Introduced by *-ne:* Capt. 139, ne fle : : egone illum non fleam! egone non defleam! Titin. 81, tibin ego non delicem!

Introduced by *ut:* Poen. 429, ut non ego te emittam manu!

Introduced by *utine:* Hec. 66, utine eximium neminem habeam!

Introduced by *-ne ut:* Asin. 884, egon ut non subripiam pallam atque ad te deferam! Truc. 441, egone illam ut non amem! egone illi ut non bene velim! — Imperfect Tense: Bacch. 197, egone ut non redderem!

Negative *ni:* Pseud. 917, quippe ego te ni contemnam!

Connecting Negative: Hec. 199, utin omnes mulieres eadem studeant nolintque neque quicquam reperias!

OPTATIVE USES.[1]

The optative is extensively used in Early Latin. All four tenses occur, though the imperfect and pluperfect are relatively rare. The usual negative is *ne,* but other negatives (*numquam* and *non*) occur in a few instances. As connecting negatives we find both *neve* (*neu*) and *neque* (*nec*). The present and perfect are frequently reënforced by strengthening particles, especially *utinam, uti, qui.* A special use is that in asseverations. Here the optative is introduced by *ita* and is often followed by an *ut*-clause correlative with *ita.*

[1] Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Sprache, iii, p. 131; 154; 179 ff.; 232; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 385; 389; 398 f.; Dräger, Hist. Synt. i, p. 310 ff.; Kühner, Ausf. lat. Gramm. ii, § 47, 4, 5; Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 133 ff.

PRESENT OPTATIVE.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Without Particles.

Under this head belong the bulk of all independent optatives found in Early Latin.   The material is extensive, but falls chiefly under a few oft-recurring formulas, of which *di te ament, di te perdant, di faciant, di dent, salvos sis, valeat,* etc., are the types.

a) Type *di te (me, vos, illum,* etc.,*) perdant:* Aul. 645; 658; Capt. 868; 909; Cas. 275; 609; and in 20 other passages. — In the form *di te perduint:* Asin. 467; Cas. 642; Curc. 720; and in 8 other passages. — In the form *Iupiter te perdat:* Amph. 569; Curc. 622; and in 2 other passages. — *Iupiter te perduit:* Epid. 66; Poen. 739.

b) Type *salvos sis:* Aul. 182; Bacch. 456; 536; Epid. 548; 549; and in 16 other passages.

c) Type *di faciant:* Amph. 380; Aul. 545; 789; and in 11 other passages.

d) Type *di tibi dent:* Asin. 46; Epid. 6; M. G. 1038; and in 9 other passages. — The form *duint* occurs in this formula in Pseud. 936; Trin. 436; and in 3 other passages.

e) Type *di te ament:* Aul. 183; Bacch. 457; and in 14 other passages.

f) Type *di bene vortant:* Aul. 175; 257; and in 10 other passages.

g) Type *valeas:* Cas. 216; Pers. 224; and in 3 other passages.

h) Type *di te infelicent:* Cas. 246; Epid. 13; and in 4 other passages.

i) Expressions similar in general character to those already noticed, but not occurring with frequency, e.g. Aul. 546, istuc sospitent; Capt. 355, di tibi omnia offerant; so Ad. 978; Curc. 130, male tibi di faciant; so Phor. 394; Curc. 588, male sit tibi; Merc. 327, bene sit tibi; so Pseud. 714; Trin. 715, bene eveniat; Curc. 39, male istis evenat; H. T. 1038, di istaec prohibeant; so Hec. 207; Ad. 700, di me oderint; And. 761, di te eradicent; so H. T. 589.   Other expressions of cursing occur at Aul. 776; Most. 192; 655; Pers. 831; of praying: Pseud. 121; Acc. Praetext. 36.

j) Apart from the foregoing, there are few instances of the construction.   Examples are: Asin. 770, caeca sit; Amph. 392, Mercu-

rius Sosiae iratus siet; 935, propitius sit potius; Asin. 15, pariter
nunc Mars adiuvet; M. G. 936, bene rem geras; Pers. 189, bona pax
sit potius; 269, vapulet; Pseud. 934, Iupiter te mihi servet; Trin.
351, quod non habes habeas; cf. also Poen. 1002; 1409; Acc. 156.

k) In Poen. 860, quem ament igitur? we have an interrogative
optative, 'Whom do you wish that they love?' Cf. 859.

Present Optative with Reënforcing Particles.

With particles the present optative has substantially the same use
as without. We find several of the same oft-recurring formulas,
notably *qui (ut, utinam) di te perdant.* But on the whole the con-
struction is more flexible, and we find relatively a much greater pro-
portion of non-formulaic expressions.

In a few cases where the optative is introduced by *utinam,* the
present is used for the imperfect and expresses a regret at the non-
reality of the idea involved.

a) Introduced by *qui.* This *qui* is the indefinite adverb. By origin
it was probably an instrumental or ablative : hence the meaning, 'in
some way,' 'just,' 'only.' Examples : Cas. 279, qui illum di per-
dant; so Rud. 1166; Trin. 923; 998; Men. 451, qui illum di omnes
perduint; 933; Phor. 123.

b) Introduced by *ut.* For the force and origin of this particle, see
p. 164. Examples : Aul. 785, ut illum di perduint; so Merc. 710;
H. T. 810; Cas. 238, ut te Mercurius perdat; so Ad. 713; Plaut.
Frag. 21, ut illum di perdant; so Pers. 298; Eun. 302; Phor. 687;
Naev. Com. 19; Stat. 114, ut te di infelicent; Asin. 21, ut superstes
uxor siet, atque ut pestem oppetas; Pers. 290; Poen. 912, valeas
beneque ut tibi sit; Rud. 82, ut hostes diffidant sibi.

c) Introduced by *utinam.* Wishes introduced by *utinam* show an
absence of the formulaic expressions so common in wishes introduced
by *ut* and *qui.* Examples : Asin. 615, utinam sic efferamur; 840,
utinam rideant; Epid. 196, utinam conveniam[1] Periphanem; Men.
1104; M. G. 1010, utinam potestas evenat; Most. 233; Pers. 289;
Pseud. 108; Rud. 158; Trin. 618, utinam te rediisse salvom videam;
And. 931, utinam id sit; Eun. 655, utinam sic sint; 1028, utinam

---

[1] Schmalz, Synt. u. Stil.³ p. 329, denies the use of the optative 1st sing. in Early
Latin; but this and several following examples sufficiently attest the usage.

videam; Hec. 536, utinam sciam; Ad. 972; Enn. Trag. 170; Pacuv.
139; Acc. 167; Turpil. 125; 192; 207; Stat. 57.

In the following the present has the force of the imperfect: Asin.
418, utinam stimulus mihi sit; Eun. 210, utinam possis.

d) Introduced by *utinam modo, modo ut:* Aul. 433, utinam mea
modo auferam; And. 409, modo ut possim; Phor. 712, ut modo fiant;
773, modo ut possiet.

Asseverative Use of the Present Optative.

A typical illustration of the asseverative use is Cas. 452, ita me
di ament, ut ego vix reprimo labra.   Numerous also are the
instances in which the asseverative optative with *ita* is followed, not
by an *ut*-clause, but by an independent indicative or subjunctive, as
M. G. 501, ita me di ament . . . dedecoris pleniorem erum faciam
tuom (512).   In both types of usage the almost unvarying formula
is: *ita me di ament (Venus amet, Iupiter amet).*

a) Type *ita . . . ut:* Aul. 445, ita me amet Laverna uti te diffe-
ram; *uti* here is Götz's conjecture.   Similarly Bacch. 111; 892; Capt.
878; Pers. 492; Pseud. 943; H. T. 686; Most. 182, ita tu me ames, ita
Philolaches tuos te amet, ut venusta's; Poen. 1258, med ita di ser-
vent, ut hic pater est voster; Phor. 807.   In the foregoing we have
the present indicative in the *ut*-clause.   The following examples
show other forms: Curc. 208, ita me Venus amet, ut ego numquam
sinam; Hec. 579, ita me di ament itaque obtingant ut numquam com-
merui; H. T. 1030, ita mihi sis superstes, ut ex me natus es; Poen.
289, ita me di ament, ut malim; Stich. 742, ita me Venus amet, ut
ego exissem.

b) Type without *ut* in the second clause.   Usually the second
clause stands in the present indicative, e.g. Most. 170, ita me di
ament, lepidast; Poen. 504; 1413; Stich. 685; And. 947; Eun. 474;
615; Phor. 165; Hec. 258; 276.   In the following examples, *ita me
di ament* is contained within the related clause or else follows it:
H. T. 383, minume, ita me di ament, miror; Eun. 882, te quoque iam,
ita me di ament, amo; Phor. 954; Hec. 206; 233; 642.

Other tenses of the indicative also occur in the second clause, e.g.
(Imperfect), Amph. 597, neque, ita me di ament, credebam; (Future)
Curc. 574, ita me bene iuvent, iam ego te faciam; Stich. 754; (Per-

fect) M. G. 725, ita me di ament, aequom fuit; 1403; Poen. 1325; H. T. 569; Eun. 1037; Phor. 883. Sometimes the *ita me di ament* is followed by a mere exclamation, as Pers. 639, ita me di ament, sapienter! Trin. 1024, — graphicum furem! Sometimes it occurs alone, without corresponding clause, as Hec. 864. The subjunctive follows in Poen. 827 and H. T. 953.

NEGATIVE PRESENT OPTATIVES.

Introduced by *ne:* Most. 307, ne umquam quisquam invideat; Trin. 351, quod habes ne habeas; Ad. 835, ne modo nos tuos animus subvortat.

Introduced by *non, numquam :* Bacch. 504, mihi numquam quisquam creduat; Cist. 555, utinam non queas; Truc. 306, numquam mihi quisquam creduit.

Connecting negatives. Here we find only *neque* (*nec*): Bacch. 847, neque Bellona mi neque Mars creduat; Pseud. 272, neque ament neque faciant bene; Enn. Trag. 363, neque umquam extollas. Cf. also Poen. 859, di omnes ament —:: quemnam hominem? : : nec te nec me.

PERFECT OPTATIVE.[1]

AFFIRMATIVE.

Without Particles.

The material under this head is restricted almost exclusively to *s*-forms, and of these, *faxit, faxint* are by far the most frequent. They look forward to the future.

Faxit, faxint: Aul. 149, ita di faxint; so 257; 788; Capt. 172; and in 14 other instances.

Other verbs: Asin. 654, di te servassint; so Cas. 324; Pseud. 37; Trin. 384; Cist. 742, servassit; Pseud. 14, prohibessit; Plaut. Frag. 63, mihi Laverna in furtis celebrassit manus; Afran. 264, di te mactassint malo; Pacuv. 112, di monerint meliora, amentiam averruncassint tuam, quoted by Lucil. 466; Men. 295, perieris; Stich. 385, perierint.

---

[1] Cf. Lübbert, Der Conjunktiv Perfecti und das Futurum Exactum im älteren Latein, 1867, p. 30 ff.

With Particles.

Amph. 632, utinam di faxint; so also H. T. 161; Hec. 354; Aul. 50, utinam me adaxint ad suspendium; Cas. 398, utinam sors deliquerit; Poen. 799, utinam abierit malam crucem; Enn. Trag. 289, qui illum di mactassint malo; And. 463, utinam hic surdus aut haec muta facta sit; Ad. 507, utinam hic sit modo defunctum.   In the preceding the reference is to the future.   In the following example we have a true present perfect, H. T. 617, ut satis contemplata sis, 'may you have examined it enough,' i.e. 'I hope you have examined it sufficiently.'

Asseverative Uses of the Perfect Optative.

Capt. 622, ita me faxit patriae compotem, ut Philocrates non est; Curc. 577, ita me amassint, ut non facio; Stich. 505, ita meas servassint filias, ut mihi volup est.

NEGATIVE PERFECT OPTATIVES.

Bacch. 468, ne di sirint; so Merc. 323; 613; Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, 36; Rud. 790, numquam hercle quisquam me lenonem dixerit, si te non ludos pessumos dimissero.   Connecting negative, Curc. 27, nec me sirit (sinit, *codd.*) Iupiter.

Morris, Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 166, notes that perfects in *-sit, -sint* are restricted almost exclusively to the optative function.

IMPERFECT OPTATIVE.

In the imperfect tense the optative expresses a regret at the non-existence of something, and is regularly accompanied by *utinam*. Usually the reference is to the present, but in two instances it is to the past.   Examples: Amph. 575, utinam ita essem; Merc. 823, utinam lex esset; Rud. 533, utinam uterer.   The other examples are Trin. 1028; And. 606; Eun. 91; 175; Ad. 453.   Referring to the past: Capt. 537, utinam te di prius perderent; Rud. 494, utinam prius in Sicilia perbiteres.

A peculiar instance of the imperfect optative is found in Most. 183, ita ego istam amarem.   This is simply an asseverative *ita ego istam amem* (cf. 182, ita Philolaches te amet) projected into the past.

No illustrations of the negative with the imperfect optative occur in Early Latin.

THE PLUPERFECT OPTATIVE.

Here *utinam* is invariably present   A number of negative uses occur.

Affirmative: Amph. 386, utinam istuc pugni fecissent tui; Rud. 497, utinam cubuissem; Truc. 375, utinam rei parsisses; Naev. Com. 43, utinam nasum abstulisset; Acc. 52, utinam me mactasset.

Negative: Enn. Trag. 205, utinam ne accedisset trabes; 241, utinam ne umquam pedem extulisses; Phor. 157, utinam ne in mentem incidisset. — Connecting negatives: Enn. Trag. 205, utinam ne accedisset trabes neve coepisset; Phor. 157, utinam ne Phormioni in mentem incidisset neu me impulisset.

POTENTIAL USES.[1]

Potential uses fall into several categories. The commonest of these is that indicated by the English auxiliaries 'should,' 'would.' But there are also 'may' and 'can' potentials. These last two varieties, however, are much less frequent.

THE 'SHOULD'–'WOULD' POTENTIAL.

Under this head belong those uses in which the validity of the statement is represented as dependent upon some condition expressed or understood. When the condition is expressed, we get one of the regular types of conditional sentences. But there is really no difference in *putem*, for example, whether we say, *eum fidelem esse putem,* or *eum si laudes, fidelem esse putem.*

All four tenses of the subjunctive occur in this use, though the present is much the commonest.

PRESENT TENSE.

I have elsewhere[2] applied the designation 'Contingent Futurity' to the use now under consideration. The usage is Indo-European, and is probably the starting-point of the somewhat different uses of

[1] Kühner, Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, §46; Dräger, Hist. Synt. i, § 148; Blase, Hist. Gramm. iii, p. 139 ff.; 155 ff.; 202 ff.; 226 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii. p. 387 ff.; 399; Morris, Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 284 ff.; 384 ff.; Rodenbusch, De temporum usu Plautino, 1888, p. 57 ff.

[2] Latin Language, § 355; 360; Critique of Subjunctive Theories, Cornell Studies, ix, passim; see also above, p. 161.

the imperfect and pluperfect tenses. In a number of instances the contingency is so slight and so vague that the difference between subjunctive and indicative sinks to a minimum. Here belong particularly *velim, nolim, malim,* as softened forms of statement for *volo, nolo, malo;* but a number of other typical uses of a similar sort also occur.

Examples : Amph. 985, nec quisquam tam audax fuat; 1060, nec me miserior feminast neque ulla videatur magis; Asin. 558, qui possis collaudare ?   Bacch. 97, id flagitium sit; 149, ut te usurpem lubens! Merc. 125, nimis nili tibicen siem ; Truc. 907, numquam hoc efficiatur opus; And. 489, hoc quis non credat abs te esse ortum ? 814, clamitent me sycophantam; Eun. 460, ex homine hunc natum dicas? Phor. 186, incendam, instigem, laterem lavem; Hec.. 434, vovisse hunc dicam; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 50, 7, periniurium siet.   H. T. 454, nedum tu possis, also probably belongs here.   If we except instances of *velim, nolim, malim* (to be considered presently), examples of the 'should'-'would' potential are relatively rare in Early Latin outside of the apodosis of conditional sentences.   In addition to the examples just cited, I have noted only 31 other instances in the entire range of this period.

Velim, Nolim, Malim.

These forms are traditionally taken as 'should'-'would' potentials. They are here accorded separate consideration because Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 137 ff.; 284 ff.) dissents from the usual view and explains the subjunctives as optative in character, — not as true optatives with the force of 'may I desire,' etc., but as optatives resulting primarily by attraction.   Morris would find the origin of *velim, nolim, malim* (in the uses here under discussion) in expressions like *veniat velim.   Velim,* he holds, is here attracted from *volo.* The somewhat frequent use of *velim, nolim, malim* in Early Latin with the infinitive, and with the accusative, he regards as extensions by analogy from the original attracted use.   But this theory involves several difficulties :

1. In Plautus (in whose works are found most of the instances for Early Latin), *velim* occurs with the simple subjunctive some 14 times. Against these 14 instances, we have 27 other instances of *velim*

unaccompanied by the subjunctive, including 10 with the infinitive, 7 with participles and adjectives, 4 with a direct object, and 6 absolute uses. As to *malim*, that is found twice with the subjunctive. Against these two instances there are 21 others where there is no accompanying subjunctive, including 13 with the infinitive, 4 with participles and adjectives, 1 with a direct object, and 3 absolute uses. *Nolim* with the subjunctive does not occur, but is found twice with the infinitive and once with a participle. Out of 70 occurrences, therefore, of *velim, nolim, malim, pervelim*, 54 are not accompanied by the subjunctive. Granting now that attraction may account for the 16 cases of the subjunctive, how are we to account for the subjunctive in the 54 remaining instances? As already stated, Morris accounts for them by analogical extension. But this is not a plausible hypothesis. There is nothing to show that *veniat velim* is older than *hoc velim* or *adire velim*. In fact the reverse seems more likely to be true. If it is so, the theory of analogy at once becomes untenable.

2. If the theory be correct that the notion of wishing involved in *veniat* has led to the use of *velim* in *veniat velim*, then we should likewise expect a similar assimilation of mood in orders preceded by *iubeo, edico, impero*, etc., in expressions of permission accompanied by *licet*, expressions of obligations accompanied by *oportet*, and expressions of necessity accompanied by *necesse est;* i.e. we should be warranted in expecting *iubeam haec vasa auferant* instead of *iubeo auferant; liceat abeas* in place of *licet abeas; confiteare necesse sit* instead of *necesse est; oporteat sit diligens*, instead of *oportet*.

3. Morris's theory of modal attraction of a governing verb is not supported by other phenomena of the language.

4. The theory is gratuitous. I cannot share Morris's feeling that in a large majority of the instances of *velim*, etc., under discussion a potential sense is excluded. On the contrary, I find no instance in which it is unnatural to take the words in the ordinary potential sense of 'I should like,' 'I should be loth,' 'I should prefer.' English abounds in instances of this use of 'I should like,' 'I shouldn't want,' 'I should prefer,' equivalent to 'I want,' 'I don't want,' 'I prefer,' e.g. 'I'd like to be rich,' 'I'd like to go to Europe,' 'I'd prefer to remain here,' etc. See my Critique of Subjunctive Theories (Cornell Studies, ix), p. 74 ff., for a fuller discussion of this topic.

Examples:[1] Aul. 670, veniat velim ; Bacch. 334, mihi dederit velim ; Men. 909, adeas velim ; Asin. 274, velim servire; Aul. 120, velim te arbitrari; Cas. 326, illam diruptam velim; Stich. 191, lumbos diffrac-tos velim ; Amph. 1058, aquam velim ; Most. 266, velim lapidem ; Cas. 464, ut velim ! 862, pervelim progrediri; Curc. 102, me pervelim sepultam ; Capt. 942, te nolim suscensere ; Merc. 539, nolim quidem ; Poen. 1150, facias mavelim; Asin. 810, emori me malim; Bacch. 514, malim vincere ; Aul. 661, emortuom me malim; Poen. 151, istuc mavelim; Epid. 119, malim amicos mersos; Eun.[2] 979, te arbitrari velim; Phor. 449, velim facias; Stat. 51, velim te opperiri; Titin. 160, velim arare; Ad. 727, malim quidem ; Eun. 66, mori me malim; Ad. 695, nolim te socordem ; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 24, 7, nolim.

Besides the foregoing examples of *velim, nolim, malim* in the weakened sense of the indicative, we find somewhat numerous in-stances of other potentials similarly employed. A typical example is, M. G. 689, hoc numquam audias. By origin this is a 'should'-'would' subjunctive, but the notion of contingency has faded out, so that the idea is, 'you would never hear under any circumstances,' i.e. 'you never do hear.' Other examples of the same kind are: M. G. 615, quis homo sit magis meus quam tu's? 761, neminem audias; 94, videas; Most. 148, nec quisquam esse auxilio queat; 278, quid olant nescias; Poen. 1416, nescias; Trin. 554, quamvis malam rem quaeras, illic reperias ; And. 460, fidelem haud ferme mulieri invenias virum, i.e. ' you scarcely ever find a man faithful to a woman ; ' H. T. 606, possit quidem ; 620; Hec. 58, paucos reperias fidelis evenire amatores; Afran. 198, non invenias locum ubi facias lutum; Cato, Agr. 17, 1, id semen legere possis; Lucil. 346, non rectius vivas; Amph. 576; 769, quid hoc sit hominis? So And. 191; cf. Poen. 92; Asin. 407, quid hoc sit negoti? Scotch-English in particular abounds in similar instances of this use of the 'should'-'would' potential with the value of the indicative, e.g. ' How old would he be ?' 'He'd be five and forty;' where in ordinary English we say, ' is.' So also in Sanskrit and Greek we find the same use of the potential; Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 371 f.; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 123. Cf. German, *ich wüsste nicht = ich weiss nicht.*

[1] Full material in Morris, op. cit., for Plautus.
[2] The examples are complete for Terence and other Early Latin writers.

Sometimes this attenuated 'should'-'would' potential is equivalent to a future indicative, e.g. Hec. 288, at sic citius qui te expedias his aerumnis reperias; Eun. 1080, facile pellas ubi velis; Ad. 829, quovis die redducas.

Instances of the kind just cited seem to me to make it unnecessary to adopt the theory propounded by Hale, Classical Philology, i, p. 21 ff. In the article referred to, Hale, in a sentence like Trin. 914, quod teneas, id desideres, explains *desideres* as the result of formal attraction to the indefinite 2d singular subjunctive of the subordinate clause. But in the passage just cited and in others of the same sort, I should be (i.e. 'am') inclined to regard the subjunctive of the main clause as simply the same attenuated 'should'-'would' subjunctive that we have already seen in the examples enumerated above. Other instances of the same kind (several of them cited by Hale in the article referred to) are: Pseud. 137, quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas; Trin. 496, ubi mortuos sis, ita sis; 1052, quom repetas invenias; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas, tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; Amph. 705, si obsequare, una plaga resolvas; Aul. 505, quoquo venias videas; 517, 520, iam hos absolutos censeas; Cas. 562, at quom aspicias tristem, frugi censeas; Cist. 33, eas si adeas, abitum quam aditum malis; 97, si ames, melius illi consulas quam rei tuae; Pseud. 1176, ubi suram aspicias, scias posse eum; H. T. 1023, rem quom videas, censeas; Eun. 61, si postules, nilo plus agas; Phor. 344, haec quom rationem ineas quam sint suavia et quam cara sint, non tu hunc habeas praesentem deum?

In the following we have the indicative in the dependent clause: Capt. 118, si data est, numquam possis prendere; Bacch. 914, si non est, nolis neque desideres; 915, si est, non queas; Trin. 671, quom inopiast, cupias; quando copiast, tum non velis; Ad. 254, abs quivis homine, quom est opus, beneficium accipere gaudeas.

'Should'-'Would' Potential as Apodosis of Conditional Sentences.

By far the most frequent use of the 'should'-'would' potential is in the apodosis of conditional sentences. The protasis of such sentences varies in form, not only in mood (though the present subjunctive is commonest), but also in tense, and in the introductory

particles.   For a fuller discussion of these points, see Conditional
Sentences.

Examples: Amph. 183, (si studeant), hominem allegent; Asin. 459,
(si sciat), suscenseat; Cist. 45, (si non nubat), familia pereat; Rud.
473, (si abstulerit), mi exhibeat negotium; And. 143, (si obiurges),
quid facias ? H. T. 74, (si sumas), plus agas; Ad. 147, (si augeam),
insaniam; Acc. 102, (nisi nobis tulat opem), peream; Stat. 32, (an ubi
vos sitis), ibi consilium claudeat? Afran. 31, (si non verear), nemo
vereatur; Lucil. 40, (si coniuret), vix satis sit; Cato (Jord.), p. 58, 8,
nolim, (si sim).

The total number of instances of the 'should '-' would ' potential in
apodosis is not far from 175.

In a considerable number of instances the present tense has a
contrary-to-fact force like the imperfect, e.g. Amph. 907, cum ea
sermonem nec habeas (nisi sis stultior); Asin. 393, (si sit domi),
dicam; Epid. 331, (si habeam), pollicear; And. 310, (si hic sis), aliter
sentias; 551, neque postulem (ni res moneat); Enn. Trag. 271, (si
curent), bene bonis sit; Stat. 126, si linguas decem habeam, vix
habeam satis.   For a fuller discussion of this topic, see Conditional
Sentences.

PERFECT TENSE.[1]

There are some 35 instances of the perfect subjunctive used as a
'should '-' would ' potential.   Like the present, the perfect also looks
forward to the future.   Originally the perfect, being an aorist op-
tative by origin, denoted momentary (i.e. non-continuing) action, as
opposed to the present, which denoted a continuing action.   This
original distinction seems to hold fairly well for the Early Latin
instances of the perfect potential.   In no one of them is there any
suggestion of continuance or duration.   Elmer's theory,[2] that the per-
fect potential is more energetic than the present, does not seem to
have won the approval of scholars.

The scanty material belonging under this head is about evenly di-
vided into two classes: First, cases in which the subjunctive stands
alone; second, those in which it is the apodosis of a conditional sen-

---

[1] See especially Cramer, De Perfecti Conjunctivi Usu Potentiali apud Priscos
Scriptores Latinos, 1886; also Lübbert, Der Conjunctiv Perfecti und das Futurum
Exactum im älteren Latein, p. 35 ff.

[2] Cornell Studies, vi, p. 114 ff.

tence. In the first class the variety of expressions is small. For the most part we have first personal forms, particularly of the *s*-perfects *faxim* and *ausim*. I give the material in full: Aul. 494, faxim; so also, Poen. 1091; 1093; Truc. 62 a; 348; Ad. 887, lubens bene faxim; so 896; Aul. 474, non ausim praeterire; similarly, Poen. 1358: Eun. 884; 904; M. G. 11, haud ausit dicere; Asin. 491, hoc nunc dixerim; 503, haud negassim; Cas. 347, M. G. 316, non empsim (both conjectural, though extremely probable and generally accepted); Truc. 629, arbitrum ceperim; 349, ego istos qui nunc me culpant, confutaverim; And. 203, ubivis facilius passus sim quam in hac re me deludier; Ad. 443, haud cito mali quid ortum ex hoc sit.

The three following passages are uncertain: Capt. 309 reads in the MSS., hoc te monitum volueram. Brix here reads *voluerim*, which certainly makes better sense. He is followed by Leo, who pertinently observes, "sanum illud esset, si dixisset 'etiam hoc.'" Phor. 426, tu te idem melius feceris, and 430, tuis dignum factis feceris, are usually regarded as future perfects (so Dziatzko and Elmer), but it is quite possible that they may be perfect subjunctives.

In the apodosis of conditional sentences the perfect subjunctive occurs some 17 times. A typical example is Cas. 424, (si me suspendam), operam luserim, fecerim, creaverim. Sometimes the protasis also stands in the perfect, e.g. H. T. 316, (si quid te fugerit), ego perierim. For the full material, see Conditional Sentences. In no instance does the perfect subjunctive represent an apodosis as contrary-to-fact, as is often the case with the present subjunctive in this use.

IMPERFECT TENSE.

By a development of usage the details of which are not clear, the 'should'-'would' potential appears also in the imperfect tense. In Plautus the usage is restricted almost wholly to the forms *vellem* and *mallem*, expressing a regret. In the case of other verbs, the imperfect in this use denotes what would be true if some contingency more or less clearly implied were real. In the great majority of cases the imperfect constitutes the apodosis of a formal conditional sentence, containing a protasis introduced by *si, nisi, ni.*

a) Without formal protasis: Asin. 589, vellem habere; so also Cist. 93; 506; Most. 980; Poen. 681; 1107, magis quam vellem;

Pseud. 309; 1057; Stich. 312; 713; Amph. 512, experiri istuc mavel-
lem; so also Bacch. 199; 452; 1047; 1201; Curc. 512; Pseud. 131.
Apart from the foregoing, the only other examples in Plautus are:
Bacch. 314, privatim servaretur rectius; Men. 160, esses agitator
probus; Poen. 1139, hodie earum mutarentur nomina facerentque
indignum quaestum; Pseud. 494, iuberes hunc trahi; And. 326, quam
vellem; so H. T. 185; 815; 978; Eun. 597; 786; Phor. 257; 792;
Hec. 464; Ad. 532; Phor. 796, nollem datum; so also Ad. 165; 775;
H. T. 953, non auderet; Eun. 606, tum pol ego is essem; 787, facerent
fugam; Phor. 121, numquam faceret; 160, non cura haec angeret
animum; 208, illud minus possem; 793, ego ostenderem; 797, quor
nolles? Ad. 395, num sineres? Afran. 308, vellem intervenissem;
Turpil. 10, apisci haut possem (posse, *codd.*); Soranus (Baehrens,
Frag. p. 273), Accius nollet, mallet.

In a few instances the imperfect is used referring to the past, like
the pluperfect, viz. Cas. 910, quom cogito, non habuit gladium, nam
esset frigidus; And. 138, diceret (= *dixisset*); H. T. 1022, pareret
(= *peperisset*). Eun. 606, tum pol is essem qui simulabar. In Ad.
314 ff., animam exstinguerem, lacerarem, arriperem, statuerem, eripe-
rem, darem, ruerem, agerem, raperem, tenderem, prosternerem, the
imperfect seems to fulfil the function of the present and to refer to
the future. So also Poen. 681, videre vos vellem quom aurum darem.

b) With accompanying protasis. Only a few typical examples of
the use are here given. For the full material, see Conditional Sen-
tences. Asin. 860, (ni essent), numquam faceret; Aul. 286, (si vel-
let), non velles; Capt. 755, (absque hoc esset), usque me ductarent;
Hec. 220, (ni id fecisset), magis mirum foret.

As regards the origin of the imperfect subjunctive in this use, we
can hardly proceed beyond hypothesis. Presumably the use of the
imperfect alone is older than the imperfect with accompanying prot-
asis. In view of this consideration and of the practical restriction
of the use in Plautus (outside of conditional sentences) to *vellem* and
mallem, one might conclude that the usage originated with these
verbs. If so, it is possible that an original *velim* or *malim adesset*
became first *vellem* (*mallem*) *adesset* by a species of tense assimilation.
The *vellem* or *mallem* might then easily become detached and embark
upon a career of independent usage. After this usage became well

established for *vellem* and *mallem*, it would naturally extend to other verbs.

PLUPERFECT TENSE.

The pluperfect potential is simply the imperfect projected into the past. But except in formal conditional sentences with expressed protasis, the usage is rare in Early Latin. Plautus has but two instances; Terence but six. Material: Epid. 628, prius venisset; Stich. 590, hau maligne vos invitassem; H. T. 540, mansisset; Eun. 453, quanto melius invitasses ? 667, illum conclusissem neque commisissem; Phor. 159, non potitus essem; Ad. 397, non olfecissem ? 630, exorassem.

In formal conditional sentences the material, though more extensive, is not abundant. For the full lists of occurrences, see Conditional Sentences. A few typical examples are here given: Asin. 396, (si adesset), recepisset; M. G. 718, (si habuissem), satis cepissem miseriarum; Eun. 673, (si cessassem), non offendissem.

'MAY' POTENTIALS.[1]

Elmer in Cornell Studies, vi. p. 176 ff., protests against recognizing a 'may' potential for Latin. Certainly the instances of the usage are not numerous either in Early Latin or at any other period of the language. Yet, in common with practically all students of Latin syntax, I am inclined to recognize its existence in a few cases. It is impossible here to review the evidence bearing on this question. I must content myself with referring to the literature cited in the footnote. I will only urge that the 'may' use, though rare, is well established for Greek (Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, 238), and that the 'may' idea bears to the 'should'-'would' idea the relation of the general to the special. Both the 'should'-'would' and the 'may' conceptions are phases of the category of future contingency. The auxiliaries 'should'-'would' suggest a future contingency which will be realized in case some special act, more or less clearly indicated, is fulfilled; the auxiliary 'may' suggests a future contin-

[1] Elmer, Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses (Cornell Studies, vi), pp. 176-197; Classical Review, xiv, 4; Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxxii, p. 205 ff., Proceedings, p. cxvii; Bennett, Critique (Cornell Studies, ix), p. 31 ff.; Hale, Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxxi, p. 140 ff.

gency dependent upon nothing in particular but upon things in general. Material: And. 640, aliquis dicat; Eun. 511, roget quis; And. 957, aliquis fors putet (aliquis forsitan me putet, *codd.*); Pseud. 432, fors fuat an, 'there may be chance whether;' Hec. 610, fors fuat pol.

Less certain are the following: Asin. 465; sit; non sit; non edepol scio, taken by Elmer and others as subjunctive of indirect question, 'whether he is or not.' But this type of indirect question is unexampled elsewhere in the early period, and occurs at best only sporadically later. It seems more natural to me, therefore, to interpret the passage as meaning, 'may be he is; may be he isn't.' Ad. 830, metuas, 'perhaps you are afraid,' 'you may be afraid;' so also Ashmore, ad loc.

'CAN' – 'COULD' POTENTIALS.[1]

In his Studies (op. cit.), Elmer protested against the indiscriminate rendering of Latin subjunctives by the modal auxiliaries 'can,' 'could,' 'might' (in the sense of 'could'). In the main I believe this attitude is sound, but with regard to one category of uses, I am equally confident that we should recognize the existence in Latin of a 'can' and 'could' potential. I refer to uses of the indefinite second singular such as *videas, videres,* 'one can see,' 'one could see.' As the English 'one could see' is ambiguous, I will say that I am here using this auxiliary in the sense of the German *konnte,* in *man konnte sehen.* Outside of the indefinite 2d singular of the present and imperfect, I do not believe that the 'can'-'could' use ought to be recognized; within these limits I am prepared to admit it in the following instances:

Present Tense: Capt. 420, videas corde amare inter se; Most. 243, videas eam me amare; Poen. 831, quodvis genus ibi hominum videas; 836, ibi tu videas litteratas epistulas; Trin. 1031, vetera amare hunc scias; And. 95, scias posse habere suae vitae modum. It will be noted that in the present tense the use is restricted to *videas* and *scias.*

---

[1] Elmer, Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, Cornell Studies, vi, p. 198 ff.; 207 ff.; Bennett, Critique, Cornell Studies, ix, p. 41 ff.; Hale, Transactions Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxxi, p. 140 ff.

The origin of the usage is probably to be sought in the 'should'-'would' potential, particularly in those weakened potentials considered at p. 200. Cf. passages like Afran. 242, scias abesse ab lustris procul, where the meaning seems to hover between the 'would' and the 'can' meaning; similarly, Poen. 585, ibi habitant, ibi eas conspicias quam praetorem saepius. Other passages which suggest the origin of the usage are M. G. 689, 761, audias; H. T. 1063, credas; Pacuv. 176, putes; Acc. 395, credas.

Imperfect Tense: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 34, 5, mare velis florere videres; Curc. 331, scires velle gratiam tuam; Ad. 827, scires (scire et, MSS.) liberum ingenium atque animum; Acc. 321, Mavortes duo congressos crederes; Lucil. 382, haerere putares; Afran. 9, terram ruere diceres; H. T. 192, miserum? quem minus crederes?

These imperfects simply represent the present use projected into the past. Elmer (Cornell Studies, vi, p. 207 ff.) regards expressions of this type as 'should'-'would' potentials, — 'you would have seen (had you been present).' For a criticism of this view, see Bennett, Cornell Studies, ix, p. 41 ff.

CHAPTER V.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.[1]

PARATAXIS AND HYPOTAXIS.[2]

In the most primitive stages of language there are no formal sub-
ordinate clauses. Subordinate *relations*, however, exist, being in-
dicated by the juxtaposition of independent sentences, as in English
'I believe, he is ill;' 'I fear, he will die.' In course of time every
language develops certain types of independent sentences into sub-
ordinate clauses. When fully developed, such subordinate sentences
usually have introductory conjunctions. But these conjunctions,
like the subordinate clauses themselves, are not original. They are
for the most part adverbs, which grew into conjunctional force as
the sentences they introduce grew into subordinate clauses.

The name 'parataxis' is used to designate the primitive grammatical
structure above referred to. While such structure is largely out-
grown in time as a language develops and matures, yet it never
entirely disappears as a type. Long after the development of sub-
ordinate clauses, we still continue to find, in every language, illustra-
tions of the expression of subordinate relationship by paratactic
means. Thus in Early Latin we find examples like the following:
Asin. 350, ausculta; scies; 723, exopta id quod vis; fiet; Rud. 1010,
tange! adfligam ad terram te; and many others in which an imperative
is equivalent to a condition; see below, p. 353. At times the jussive
subjunctive is used as a protasis, e.g. Cato, Agr. 157, 4, in ea volnera
teras brassicum; sanum faciet; Trin. 441, hic postulet frugi esse;

---

[1] See in general Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina.

[2] See especially Morris, Principles and Methods in Syntax, p. 113 ff.; Bennett,
Critique of Recent Subjunctive Theories (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, ix,
p. 66 ff.); Jolly, Curtius' Studien, vi, p. 215 ff.; Weissenhorn, Parataxis Plautina, 1884;
Weninger, De parataxis in Terenti fabulis vestigiis, 1888; Becker, Beiordnende und
unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altrömischen Bühnendichtern, 1888; Lindskog,
Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos, 1896; Sven Tessing, Syn-
taxis Plautina, 1892, p. 82 ff.; Paul, Principien der Sprachgeschichte,[3] p. 133 ff.;
Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Grammatik, p. 650; Delbrück, Vgl. Syntax, iii, p. 413.

nugas postulet; see above, p. 178. Sometimes a causal relation is involved, as And. 670, hac non successit, alia adgrediemur via; Epid. 590, negat haec filiam me suam esse; non ergo haec mater mea est.

In a narrower sense the name 'parataxis' is applied to those specimens of paratactic structure which ultimately develop in the history of a given language into subordinate clauses. Hypotaxis is merely another name for subordination, convenient as marking the contrast with its opposite parataxis.

It must not be thought, however, that the absence of a special subordinating particle is necessarily the mark of a paratactic form of expression and that where such particles are lacking we are to recognize independent uses. The subordinate relation often established itself without the help of special subordinate conjunctions. Thus in *tibi impero abeas, abeas* is just as truly subordinate as *ut abeas* in *tibi impero ut abeas.* In Early Latin we find many such subordinate clauses without an introductory conjunction. While these were undoubtedly at one time at the paratactic stage, they are at present best regarded as but the relics of an earlier parataxis. Many circumstances point to this. But the detailed discussion of this topic is best postponed until after the presentation of the main facts of usage falling under this head (p. 244 f.).

The present chapter is devoted to a consideration of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses. Our object will be to determine as far as possible the original paratactic usage out of which the several varieties of subjunctive constructions have arisen, and to give the material belonging under each.

SUBJUNCTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.[1]

Subjunctive substantive clauses form an extremely large category, probably the largest single category of subordinate subjunctive uses. All the main original types of usage (volitive, optative, potential) appear in these clauses.

For Plautus we have a detailed study of these substantive clauses in the work of C. L. Durham, Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, xiii). This work

---

[1] Indirect questions are not included here, but will be considered later.

has been made the basis of treatment, so far as Plautus is concerned, in what follows.   For Terence and the minor Early Latin writers, I have made independent collections.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE VOLITIVE.

Most of these are regarded by many grammarians as substantive clauses of purpose, — such clauses for example as *taceat oportet; licet abeas; necesse est loquamur; tibi impero ut hoc mihi des; sino dicat.*   Such a designation implies either that the clauses in question *are* purpose clauses, or that they once *were* such.   Neither of these alternatives, however, represents the probable truth.   Most clauses denominated 'substantive clauses of purpose' are developed more or less directly from fundamental volitive uses (jussive, prohibitive, deliberative), and never indicated purpose at all.   The fuller justification of this statement is best presented in the following discussion of the various types of clauses falling under this head.   But before proceeding to our classification, it is necessary to make certain preliminary observations on original uses and extensions.

Original Uses and Extensions.

As a typical illustration of the general type here under discussion, let us take the sentence, *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des.*   Whether *ut* is present or absent is immaterial to our present purpose.   In either case the dependent clause is of jussive origin (cf. Schnoor, Zum Gebrauch von *ut* bei Plautus, p. 1); *ut* is simply the adverbial particle which we have already met in independent sentences (see p. 165).   The original difference between *tibi impero hoc mihi des* and *tibi impero ut hoc mihi des,* could hardly have been more than that between 'I command you, give me this,' and 'I command you, just give me this.'   Probably even this distinction soon passed away, and the two forms of expression came to be felt as practically equivalent in force.

Taking now our *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* as the type, let us consider a variety of extensions to which it gave rise:

a) 'Extensions within the Present.'   After the analogy of *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* it became natural to form sentences like:

> mihi imperat (ut) hoc sibi dem;
> tibi imperat (ut) hoc sibi des;
> illi imperat (ut) hoc sibi det;
> illi imperas (ut) hoc tibi det;
> mihi imperas (ut) hoc tibi dem.

Our original sentence, *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* was undoubtedly once paratactic: 'I command you: give this to me!' But the developments just enumerated could obviously never have stood in parataxis; they are analogical 'Extensions within the Present.'

b) 'Future Extensions.' An illustration would be, *tibi imperabo (ut) hoc mihi des.* A sentence like this could obviously have never stood in parataxis. It is simply *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* projected into the future.

c) 'Past Extensions.' An illustration would be, *tibi imperavi (ut) hoc mihi dares.* Here similarly we have our *tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des* projected into the past.

d) 'Negative Extensions.' These are exemplified by *tibi non impero (ut) hoc mihi des.* These negative extensions may also be combined with extensions of the kinds already noted, e.g. *tibi non imperabo (ut) hoc mihi des* (future extension); *tibi non imperavi (ut) hoc mihi dares* (past extension); *mihi non imperat (ut) hoc sibi dem;* (within the present).

e) 'Interrogative Extensions.' These are exemplified by *quare tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des?* These interrogative extensions may be at the same time also future, past, within the present, or negative, e.g. *quis tibi imperat (ut) hoc mihi des? quis tibi imperavit (ut) hoc mihi dares? cur mihi non non imperavisti (ut) hoc tibi darem?*

f) 'Conditional Extensions,' e.g. *si tibi impero (ut) hoc mihi des.* These similarly may be also future, past, within the present, or negative; or they may contain a combination of these extensions, e.g. *si mihi non imperavisti (ut) hoc tibi darem,* a conditional negative past extension.

g) 'Extension by Analogy of the Meaning of the Verb.' Thus *te oro (ut) abeas* undoubtedly represents an original parataxis: 'Just go away! I beg you,' = 'I beg you to go away.' Now after the analogy of this we get *te exoro (ut) abeas,* 'I induce you to go away,'

'I succeed in my-request-that-you-go-away.' Similarly after *tibi suadeo (ut) abeas,* 'I advise you to go away,' we get *tibi persuadeo (ut) abeas,* 'I succeed in my-advice-that-you-go-away,' i.e. 'I persuade you to go away.' Neither *te exoro (ut) abeas* nor *tibi persuadeo (ut) abeas* could have stood in parataxis. Such combinations would have made no sense.

A recognition of the foregoing varieties of 'Extensions' is of great importance for an understanding of substantive clauses developed from the volitive, and in fact for many other varieties of subordinate clauses of subjunctive origin, e.g. purpose clauses, substantive clauses developed from the optative, clauses of characteristic, result clauses, etc. No theory of origin can possibly account for all, or even any proportionally large part of the phenomena ordinarily classified under any one of these syntactical usages. The greater portion of all the instances belonging under each of these heads would doubtless represent analogical extensions of one sort or another.

CLASSIFICATION OF SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE VOLITIVE.

DEVELOPED FROM THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

1. With verbs of ordering and commanding.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the subjunctive substantive clause with verbs of ordering and commanding is well illustrated by Poen. 1155, dico, tuam mihi filiam despondeas; originally paratactic: 'pledge me your daughter; I bid you;' cf. Truc. 839, eloquere haec erae; puerum reddat; Pseud. 511, dico ut caveas; cf. Capt. 844, ita dico, magnus ut sit, which may represent the paratactic stage; Merc. 465, ne bitas, dico; cf. And. 205, tibi dico, ne temere facias, which may represent the paratactic stage.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (12):

dico (3): Poen. 1155 (cited above); Stich. 624, dixi equidem in carcerem ires; Afran. 316, se obsequentem atque hilare dixi praebeat.

[1] Durham, p. 13 ff.

iubeo (8): Men. 955, servos iube hunc ad me ferant; Most. 930, iube in urbem veniat; Pers. 605; Rud. 708; Stich. 396; Eun. 691, iube respondeat; H. T. 737, iube maneat; Ad. 915.

postulo: Lucil. 526, rem cognoscas et adtendas postulo.

praedico: Merc. 51, praedicere omnes timerent.

2) With *ut* (87):

dico (21): Capt. 844, ita dico, magnus ut sit; Men. 990, dico ut imperium meum sapienter habeatis curae; 1044; M. G. 1089, dic domum ut transeat; Pers. 281, dico ut pereas; Trin. 583, dic me ut conveniat; And. 594, ut adparetur dico; H. T. 340, dicam ut revortatur; 651; 781, dicebam ut dares; Eun. 735.

edico (11): Pseud. 855, edico tibi ut properes; Men. 784, edixi tibi ut caveres; Pseud. 897; Pacuv. 187, edicam frequentes ut eant; Acc. 508, edicite ut omnes adhibeant; CIL, i, 196, 3, exdeicendum censuere, utei venirent.

iubeo (3): Amph. 205, Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant; Poen. 4, audire iubet bonoque ut animo sedeant; Pseud. 1150, me iussit ut mecum mitteres.

mando (10): Merc. 835, mando rem ut tutemini; Bacch. 526, mandas mihi Mnesilochum ut requiram; Merc. 426, mandavit mihi ut emerem; 428; Stich. 652; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, mando uti cures.

impero (5): Bacch. 702; Men. 840, imperat ut illic oculos exuram; 855; Pseud. 697; Pacuv. 331, mihi classem imperat ut deducerem.

flagito: Merc. 178, flagitas me ut eloquar.

decerno: CIL, ii, 5041, decreivit utei leiberei essent.

censeo: CIL, i, 196, 26, utei inceideretis censuit.

postulo (4): And. 550, postulo ut fiat; Eun. 1058, postulo ut mihi tua domus pateat.

praecipio (3): M. G. 795, ita praecipito mulieri ut simulet; Pseud. 161.

doceo (3): Pseud. 1194, docuit ut abduceres; Epid. 364.

perdoceo: Capt. 719, perdocere ut consulerem tibi; Poen. 195.

edoceo: M. G. 355, edocebo ut sint malae.

disco: Poen. 280, haec didici omnia :: etiamne ut ames? *Disco* here serves as the passive of *doceo*, and therefore takes the same construction.

nuntio (3) : Poen. 1118, nuntiate ut prodeat; Eun. 339.

monstro : Men. 788, quotiens monstravi tibi viro ut morem geras.

praemonstro : Trin. 342, praemonstro tibi ut te miserescat.

praedico : Pseud. 517, praedico ut caveas.

provoco : Curc. 355, provocat me ut ludam.

clamito : Pseud. 1276, clamitant me uti revortar.

vocito : Most. 876, ut eant vocitantur (vocantur, *codd.*).

respondeo : Amph. 214, respondent se suos tutari posse, pro-
inde uti deducerent.

tabulas fero : Bacch. 811, tabulas tetuli ut vincirer.

negotium dare (3) : Eun. 544, mi hoc negoti dedere ut quae-
ram; And. 3.

verbis arcesso : M. G. 1185, matris verbis arcessito ut eat
tecum.

   Also with the following nouns suggesting the idea of ordering :

lex : Phor. 125, lex est ut orbae nubant.

multa ('fine,' suggesting the order of the court) : Asin. 801,
haec multa esto, vino ut careat; Capt. 494.

nuntius : Trag. Incert. (Ribb. i, p. 275), postquam ut venirem
tetigit aures nuntius.

   The substantive clause may also depend upon the general idea in-
volved in the context, e.g. Phor. 719, transito ad uxorem, ut con-
veniat, i.e. 'go over to my wife and tell her to meet;' so also Pers.
165 and elsewhere.

   3) With *ne* (41).

edico (14) : Pseud. 506, ne quisquam credat nummum, edicam;
903; Eun. 578, edicit ne adeat; 806, edico ne vim facias; Hec. 565;
CIL, i, 196, 4, 7, exdeicendum censuere, neiquis velet; ibid. 19,
exdeicendum, ne quisquam velet neve velent; ibid. 10, exdeicendum
sacerdos nequis eset.

dico (6) : Merc. 465, ad portum ne bitas dico; Trin. 520, per
deos dico ne tu illunc agrum tuom siris fieri; Epid. 164, dicam ne
hinc foras exambulet neve veniat; Asin. 938; Ad. 796, dictum fuit
ne curares.

interdico (4) : M. G. 1057, interdixi meam ne sic volgo polli-
citere operam; Pers. 621; Hec. 563, interdico ne velis.

mando : Curc. 549, mandasti nuntium ne spernerem ; Pacuv.

116, mandat ne fuat copia.

> impero : Eun. 578, mihi ne abscedam imperat.
> postulo : Stat. 139, hoc postulo ne limassis caput.
> eminor interminorque : Capt. 791, eminor interminorque

nequis mihi obstiterit ; And. 496, interminatus sum ne faceres.

> consuefacio : Ad. 54, ne celet consuefeci.
> desuesco : Titin. 46, desuevi ne quo ad cenam iret.
> edoceo : Phor. 783, Phanium edocebo ne quid vereatur.
> praedico : Aul. 99, praedico ne intromiseris.
> praecipio : M. G. 247, id praecipiundumst ne titubet.
> nuto : Men. 612, nutat ne loquar.
> monstro : Men. 788, monstravi tibi ne id observes.
> auris obtundo : Cist. 118, auris obtundo ne quem ames.
> signum do : M. G. 123, mihi signum dedit ne se appellarem.
> documentum do : Capt. 752, illis documentum dabo ne tale

quisquam facinus incipere audeat.

Also with nouns suggesting the idea of ordering: Enn. Frag. 481, hoc erit argumentum ne quid expectes amicos.

4) With *ut ne* (3) : M. G. 185 a, hoc ei dicito ut ne quoquam de ingenio degrediatur; Poen. 888, indicasso ei ut ne enuntiet; Bacch. 749, quid istis ad istunc usust conscriptis modum, ut tibi nequid credat ?

5) In CIL, i, 196, 10, we find *neque . . . neque* after edico, viz. magister neque vir neque mulier quisquam eset.

2. With *volo* and *nolo* in the senses, 'I want you to,' 'I want you not to.' [1]

These verbs often express a mere desire. As such they govern a substantive clause developed from the optative (p. 249), or the infinitive. But they are often used to convey an authoritative command, and in that sense the substantive clause used with them is volitive in character.

a) ORIGIN. The origin of such clauses is seen in expressions like M. G. 546, erum exhibeas, — volo ; And. 418, uxorem ducas, volo. In both of these passages *volo* is equivalent to *iubeo*, *praecipio*, or some such word.

b) FORM. The material falls under the following categories:

[1] Durham, p. 20 ff.

1) With *volo*, expressed or clearly understood from the context (31); the examples are about evenly divided between the simple subjunctive (17) and the subjunctive with *ut* (14), e.g. M. G. 546, erum exhibeas volo; Hec. 753, scin quid volo facias? And. 418, uxorem ducas volo; Poen. 593; Pseud. 1147; Bacch. 988 a, volo ut facias; Rud. 1216, volo ut memineris; Epid. 463; Turpil. 68.   There is also an instance of *volo ne . . . . quidem*, viz. Phor. 819, ne filii quidem resciscant volo.

2) In answers to the query, *numquid vis* or *numquid aliud* (14). Here also we find the simple subjunctive (5), the subjunctive with *ut* (7), and *ne* (2).   Examples: Bacch. 604, numquid vis? : : abeas; Curc. 525; Poen. 801; Pseud. 665, numquid vis? : : ut abeas; M. G. 259; 575, numquid vis? : : ne me noveris; Bacch. 757.

3) With *quid vis* (8).   Here we regularly find the simple subjunctive, e.g. Stich. 115, quid vis dicam?   Bacch. 692, quid vis curem?   H. T. 846.   But Phor. 322 has the subjunctive with *ut*, quid vis nisi uti maneat?

In *quid vis curem?* and similar expressions Durham (p. 23) suggests the possibility of taking the subjunctive as independent, as in the Greek τί βούλει ποιῶ; but rejects this as less natural.   It may even be questioned whether ποιῶ in such cases was not subordinate.

4) With *vis, vin, visne, voltisne* (28); always with the simple subjunctive, e.g. Capt. 360, vin vocem? : : voca; Stich. 397, vin administrem? M. G. 335; Pers. 575; Eun. 894.   Here again some may prefer the theory of an independent subjunctive (deliberative) reënforced by *vin*, etc., but it seems more natural to regard the subjunctive as dependent.

5) Expressions of the type, *nolo ames.*   See below.

Durham (Subjunctive Substantive Clauses, p. 24) brings under the volitive head several clauses dependent upon *malo*, but these all seem to me purely optative in character.

The Type *Nolo Ames.*

Nolo followed by a simple subjunctive occurs in the following passages: Pers. 245, nolo ames; Cas. 232, quam ted amo? : : nolo ames; Pseud. 436; Most. 1176, nolo ores (bis); Stich. 734, nolo obtaedescat; Truc. 558, vasa nolo auferant; Trin. 945, nolo prae-

dices; H. T. 701, nolo mentiare; Imbrex (Ribb. Com. p. 39) nolo te vocent; Afran. 155, nolo exeas (*es pus*, codd.); 203, nolo te videat.

Expressions of this type are best explained as arising by analogy and as modelled after expressions like *volo videas,* 'I want (direct) you to see.' English, 'I don't want you to stay out after dark,' and many similar expressions are likewise analogical, 'I don't want' having the force of 'I want you not to.'

Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 298; Principles and Methods, p. 137) offers another explanation of expressions of this kind. According to him, *nolo ames* begins with the prohibition *ne ames* and "then when the emphasis of an added verb of will is desired, *nolo* is used instead of *ne volo*." But this seems cumbrous and unnatural. The theory of analogical extension, on the other hand, finds support from Merc. 1004, nil opus resciscat.[1]

3. Verbs of Begging, Requesting, etc., including, as extensions, verbs of succeeding in one's request (*impetro, exoro*).[2]

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause with verbs of begging, requesting, etc., is seen in such expressions as Merc. 992 a, pacem faciatis oro ('make peace, I beg you'); cf. also sentences like the following, in which the imperative is used instead of the jussive subjunctive: Ad. 281, obsecro te, istum absolvitote; And. 351, obsecro, me libera. A negative example is Most. 744, obsecro, ne indicium ero facias meo.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (14).[3]

quaeso (3): Capt. 340, te quaeso hunc mihi des; Men. 1073, quaeso ignoscas; And. 305, quaeso id velis.

oro (8): Amph. 257, orant ignoscamus peccatum suom; Merc. 992 a, modo pacem faciatis oro; Most. 680, roga circumducat; Pers. 634, rogarat diceret; Hec. 721, te oro adiutor sis; Pacuv. 122, hoc oro minus inexorabilem faxis; CIL, i, 1175, te orant se condemnes; M. G. Arg. Acros. 13.

---

[1] For a fuller discussion of the question here at issue, see my Critique, p. 71 ff.; Durham, p. 25 f.

[2] Durham, p. 26 ff.

[3] In some of the examples it may be possible that the *quaeso, oro,* or *obsecro* is merely parenthetical. It is difficult to draw the line between the parenthetical use and that with an object clause.

obsecro (3): Aul. 715, obsecro vos mi auxilio sitis; Most. 1156, te obsecro stultitiae eius ignoscas; M. G. 540, te obsecro inscitiae meae ignoscas.

amabo: Rud. 427, amabo vel tu mi aias vel neges.

2) With *ut*, very frequently (over 200 instances).

oro (73): Amph. 1144, te oro promissa ut serves tua; Epid. 728, oro te mihi ut ignoscas; Bacch. 909, oro ut facias; Merc. 997, ora ut ignoscat delictis tuis; Poen. 1015, orat operam ut des sibi; And. 538, oro ut adiuves; 548; H. T. 493, idem oro ut facias; Eun. 533, orabat ut redires; Phor. 1020, oro ut feras; Turp. 211, hoc te oro ut commiserescas.

obsecro (37): Amph. 388, obsecro ut per pacem liceat alloqui; Cist. 767, te obsecro ut reddas mihi; Curc. 630, obsecro ut nos facias certiores; Men. 1007, opsecro te operam mihi ut des; And. 402, obsecravit ut darem; H. T. 1026, obsecro ut memineris; Titin. 31, obsecro ut mihi subvenias.

quaeso (23): Bacch. 1019, quaeso ut sat habeas id; Curc. 629, quaeso uti mihi dicas; M. G. 1362, quaeso ut memineris; Aul. 611, id te quaeso ut prohibessis; Ad. 598, quaeso ut eas atque dicas; Hec. 786, quaeso ut serves; Eun. 466.

rogare (19): Curc. 330, argenti rogo ut faciat copiam; Merc. 787, rogato meum patrem ut veniat; Rud. 1212, roga ut relinquat alias res; Pers. 600, roga ut tibi percontari liceat; Ad. 776, rogat ut redeas; Hec. 390, ut sibi des rogat; CIL, i, 542, rogans ut faxseis.

obtestor (2): Aul. 791, te obtestor ut mi ignoscas; Rud. 635.

amo, particularly amabo (4): Cist. 104, nunc te amabo ut hanc hic sinas esse; Truc. 872; Eun. 537, amabo ut transeas.

invoco (3): Merc. 864, invoco vos ut me tutetis; Amph. 1093.

peto: Phor. 378, peto mi ut respondeas.

postulo: Aul. 318, infit postulare ut liceat.

expeto: Men. 762 b, expetit me ut ad sese irem; Cas. 430.

veneror: Aul. 8, venerans me ut id servarem.

exposco: Enn. Trag. 142, exposco ut fiat.

exobsecro: M. G. 169, exobsecrant videre ut liceret.

invito: Trin. 27, ni id me invitet ut faciam fides.

mentionem facio: Aul. 204, ubi mentionem fecero mi ut despondeat; Cist. 134.

litteras (epistulam) do : Bacch. 389, litteras misi ut inveniret; 561; M. G. 130.

Also upon the general idea of the context in expressions like Rud. 274, tibi amplectimur genua ut tuo recipias tecto servesque nos; Bacch. 589, paucis me misit miles, vel ut cc Philippos reddat vel ut hinc eat; Phor. 38.

3) With *ne* (34).

obsecro (15): Curc. 605, obsecro parentes ne meos mihi prohibeas; Most. 744, obsecro ne indicium ero facias meo; Capt. 443, opsecro infidelior mihi ne fuas; H. T. 291, obsecro, ne me conicias; 1028; Phor. 944, obsecro ne facias; Liv. And. Trag. 23; Acc. 555, quod te obsecro aspernabilem ne haec taetritudo me faxsit.

quaeso (7): Aul. 210, quaeso ne id te pigeat; Bacch. 1013, quaeso ne me deseras; Stat. 125, quaeso ne addas malum; 78.

oro (5) : Capt. 244, te oro ne me secus honore honestes; H. T. 26, vos oratos volo ne plus possit oratio; 623; Hec. 338.

obtestor (3): Capt. 727, te obtestor, ne tu istunc hominem perduis; 319, optestor, ne tuom animum avariorem faxint divitiae meae; And. 291.

venero : Bacch. 173, venero te ne me sinas convenire.

deprecor: Asin. 946, deprecari huic seni ne vapulet.

ago: Rud. 605, ago cum illa nequid noceat.

4) With *ut ne* (7): Poen. 392, obsecro ut huic irata ne sis; And. 326, obsecro ut ne ducas; 899; Rud. 627, quaeso ut te ne pigeat; And. 834, oro ut ne inducas; Eun. 956, orante ut ne faceret; Pers. 109, (mentionem feceras) ut muraena et conger ne calefierent.

5) With *ni:* Men. 880, quaeso ni me indicetis; Pacuv. 123, ni turpassis vanitudine aetatem tuam, oro; cf. the occasional use of *ni* for *ne* in independent volitive uses (above, p. 169).

With *impetro, exoro*.[1]

Just as the foregoing verbs of begging and requesting take a subjunctive substantive clause, so *impetro* and *exoro*, signifying, 'to succeed in one's request,' take by analogy the same construction; see p. 211 f.

1) Without *ut:* Trin. 591, tandem impetravi abiret; Cas. 270,

[1] Durham, p. 12; 32 ff.

quid si impetro eam illi permittat? (most editors, following Guyet, make this verse conform to the mode of expression in 269, where we have *impetro ut*).

　　2) With *ut* (28).

　　　impetro (19): Cas. 269, si impetro atque exoro ut eam illi permittat; Capt. 515, ut impetres eum hominem ut convenias; Merc. 544, impetravi egomet me ut corrumperem; And. 313, impetrabo ut prodat; Eun. 181, impetrare ut concedas; Enn. Trag. 299, impetrem ut cernat; Stat. 154, quae hoc impetrarit, paelice ut meum privarem virum? Turp. 86, haec si impetro ut facias.

　　　exoro (9): Men, 1049, si possum exorare ut pallam reddat; Rud. 1218, exores Plesidippum ut me manu emittat; Cas. 705; H. T. 358, exora ut adsimulet; 705; Phor. 489, exorare ut maneas.

　　3) With *ne* (5): Bacch. 521, exorabo pater ne noceat neu quid ei suscenseat; 690; Cas. 304, exoraverit ne Casinam ducat; Cist. 303; Hec. 52, impetrare ne inrideant.

　　4) With *ut ne:* only Bacch. 533, impetravi ut ne quid ei suscenseat.

Some regard the substantive clause with these verbs as one of result, and if one were to decide the question purely on the basis of the logical relation of the dependent clause, this attitude might seem justified; but in view of the fact that the dependent clause sometimes lacks *ut,* and in the negative form has *ne (ut ne),* the explanation of an extension by analogy seems sufficiently established.

In Most. 1170, aliud quidvis impetrari a me facilius perferam quam ut non ego istum pessum premam, the *ut non* clause seems to indicate that after *quam* the substantive clause was felt to be so loosely attached that the original negative (*ne*) was no longer retained.

4. Verbs of Advising, Warning, Exhorting, Reminding, Admonishing, etc., including (as extensions) verbs of Inducing, and (as extensions of verbs of Inducing) verbs of Compelling.[1]

　a) ORIGIN. The origin of this type may be seen in expressions like Merc. 1015, dicamus senibus legem censeo; Lucil. 594, submittas alios censeo; Eun. 583, adhortor properent; Hec. 766, hoc te moneo periclum facias; Phor. 102, censeo eamus; cf. Men. 569, male habeas; sic censeo.

───────

[1] Durham, p. 35 ff.

b) Form.

1) Without *ut* (12) : Besides the examples already cited under a, we find: Asin. 644, quod faciamus nobis suades ; Trin. 681, meam sororem tibi dem suades; Poen. 730; Rud. 1275; 1277; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, censeo relinquamus, eamus; Turp. 81, hortatur quam primum proficisceret; Pers. Arg. 3.

2) With *ut* (62).

moneo (6): Capt. 240, ted ut memineris moneo; Stich. 42; Trin. 674; And. 22, ut quiescant moneo ; 904, ut faciam monet.

censeo: Merc. 483, quo leto censes me ut peream.

suadeo (11) : Curc. 163, ut sistas suadeo ; Rud. 879, suadeo ut ad nos abeant; Asin. 914; And. 577, suadet ut maturem ; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, suadent ut accipiatis ; Enn. Ann. 194, 11, suasset ut faceret.

hortor (7) : Cas. 422, hortemur ut properent; M. G. 1189; Pers. 841, hortantur tuo ut imperio pareat; Acc. 229, hortatur me ut meos manderem natos; Afran. 140 ; Turp. 123, hortari ut celerent lembum.

insto (4): And. 661, instare ut dicam; H. T. 895; Hec. 827, instare ut dicat.

commoneo : And. 280, neque commoneat ut servem fidem.

submoneo: Eun. 570, submonuit. : : quid ? : : ut vestem mutem.

canto : Trin. 287 b, canto ut caveas.

auctor sum (7): Merc. 312, auctor sum ut me amando enices; Aul. 251 ; Stich. 128, auctores ita sunt, ut hinc abducam ; Phor. 625, auctores fuere ut daret.

consilium do : Stich. 73, consilium dabo ut exoremus; Eun. 1045.

verba facio : Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, verba facio ut augeatis.

famam trado : Trin. 642, hanc maiores famam tradiderunt ut eorum anteparta perderes ?

venit in mentem, 'the suggestion presents itself': Curc. 558, venit in mentem mihi argentum ut petam; Pseud. 134.

Also with nouns like *verbum, sententia* in the sense of 'advice': Curc. 32, quid istuc est verbi ? : : caute ut incedas ; Pseud. 379, haec meast sententia, ut consulas.

In the table of contents of Cato's De Agr. the topics take the form of substantive clauses dependent upon the general idea of advising or recommending, e.g. cap. 110, virgas ut serves.

3) With *ne* (11): Pers. 680, ne permittas domum moneo; Pseud. 915; Hec. 64, moneo et hortor ne misereat; Eun. 16, ne erret moneo; Stich. 608, suades ne bitat; Asin. 462; Cas. 341, instat ne detur; Enn. Ann. 253, horitatur ne faciam; Phor. 910, me dehortatus est ne darem; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, dissuasuri ne accipiatis; Trin. 81, ne admittam promus (= monitor) sum.

4) With *ut ne:* only Epid. 355, ita suasi seni ut ne tibi eius copia esset.

5) *Ut nullus:* Phor. 547, ni instigemus ut nullus locus relinquatur.

6) *Ut non:* Enn. Frag. 515, suadent Saturno ut de regno non concedat, where *non* may be adhaerescent.

With Verbs of Inducing, Persuading, etc.

Durham (p. 37) observes, "That the subjunctive with verbs of these meanings is purely an extension after the analogy of verbs of urging, seems a necessary conclusion for two reasons: (1) Their meaning is incompatible with any theory of a jussive origin; e.g. we cannot imagine an original paratactic type of expression such as, *abeas, persuadeo* in the sense of 'depart: I persuade you to,' for such a collocation would be meaningless. (2) In striking confirmation of the foregoing impossibility is the fact that verbs of inducing are never found in Plautus with subjunctives which can be regarded as representing the original type."

It remains then to consider *persuadeo* and verbs of similar meaning as following the analogy of *suadeo*, etc.; cf. the use of *impetro* with the subjunctive after the analogy of its use with *oro*. In refutation of the view advocated by some scholars that the substantive clause with verbs of persuading and inducing is one of result, cf. the discussion in connection with *impetro, exoro,* etc. Verbs of inducing and persuading, like *impetro* and *exoro,* take *ne* as a negative and in the affirmative clauses sometimes have the subjunctive without *ut;* both of which facts point to a volitive origin. The following verbs of inducing and persuading occur in Early Latin:

1) Without *ut:* Lucil. 503, mihi non persuadetur mutem; M. G. Arg. I, 10, impellit militem omissam faciat concubinam.

2) With *ut* (21).

persuadeo (3): Merc. 331, persuadere ut illam vendat; Bacch. 964, persuasit se ut amitteret; Truc. 201.

animum induco (3); Cist. 633, animum inducam ut consulam; Stich. 346, animum inducam ut arbitrer; Poen. 877.

induco (3): Asin. 494, numquam hodie induces ut tibi credam; M. G. 254; Merc. 350.

impello (4): And. 524, impulit ut crederem; Phor. 733, quod ut facerem egestas me impulit; Hec. 426; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232, te impulit ut sis.

perpello (2): Epid. 87, perpuli ut censeret; Bacch. 644; And. 828.

perduco: Most. 198, nequis perduci ut vera haec credas.

adduco: Lucil. 418, adducta ut reiceret.

delenio: Stich. Arg. II, 4, delenitur ut sineret.

exsculpo: Cist. 541, exsculpsi ut diceret; Lucil. 49.

animum domo: Cas. 252, domuisti animum ut facias.

3) With *ne* (5): Asin. 832, possum inducere animum ne aegre patiar; M. G. 187, ut vincat ne is se viderit; 568, vincam animum ne arbitrer; 1269; Merc. 331, huic persuadere ut illam vendat neve det.

With Verbs of Forcing.

Durham (p. 38) notes, " No original uses with verbs of forcing occur and this can hardly cause surprise; for an originally paratactic *cogo, abeas* is logically inconceivable. The only explanation of the substantive clause with these verbs seems to be that they are a further extension by analogy of verbs of inducing. Just as soon as *eum perpuli ut abiret* came to be a part of the mechanism of the language, just so soon an *eum subegi ut abiret* could be counted on as its inevitable successor." This attitude seems the sound one.

1) Without *ut:* only Rud. 681, quae vis vim mi afferam ipsa adigit.

2) With *ut* (24).

cogo (11): Bacch. 508, cogam ut mendicet; Men. 877; Most. 893, non potes cogere ut maledicam; Hec. 268, cogere ut rediret;

571; 787; Ad. 851 cogam ut cubet; Enn. Ann. 122, cogebant ut midererent.

subigo (12): Epid. 235, subigunt ut faciant; Most. 917, subegi ut sumeret; Poen. 290; Stich. 193; Trin. 848, nunc subigor ut dicam.

redigo: Acc. 515, ut credam, multa argumenta redigunt animum.

5. With *fac, facito,* and other forms of *facio.*[1]

a) ORIGIN.   The origin of the subjunctive substantive clause with *facio* is probably to be sought in such combinations as Poen. 1035, linguam compescas face; Asin. 726, animo sis bono face; Cas. 146, facite accersatis; Trin. 800, uti celes face; Rud. 1218, fac ut exores; cf. Stich. 185, veni: sic face.   No fewer than 175 instances like the above are found in Early Latin with and without *ut,* — nearly 150 of the latter alone.   Apparently the construction started in connection with the imperative of *facio,* and from that extended to other forms of *facio,* e.g. Amph. 876, faciam res fiat palam; Pers. 73, faxim appareant; Stich. 177, paupertas fecit ridiculus forem; Aul. 797, feci ut esses; 545, di faciant ut siet; Pseud. 1100, facere ut det.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (140).

a) Following *fac, facite* (68):[2]

Present: Amph. 976, fac adsis, Sosia; Asin. 726, animo sis bono face; Capt. 439, fac fidelis sis; Cas. 421, fac accures; 521, fac vacent aedes; 527, fac habeant linguam tuae aedes; Curc. 414, fac sciam; so also 617; Men. 890; M. G. 277; Pseud. 696; Rud. 1023; Trin. 174; Epid. 567, fac videam; Merc. 498, face cum praeda recipias; M. G. 812, praecepta sobrie adcures face; 1360; Most. 854, canem abducat face; Pers. 195, has tabellas fac des; 198; 438; Poen. 893, fac id noscam; 1035; Pseud. 157, fac plenum ahenum sit; 236; 481; Frag. 67, face olant aedes arabice; Aul. 407, facite totae plateae pateant; Bacch. 754, facite accubitum eatis; Cas. 146, facite accersatis; Pseud. 181, facite iam hic adsint; Rud. 621, facite hic lege potius liceat; H. T. 925, fac sentiat; Eun. 189, fac adducantur; 196, meus fac sis postremo animus; 207; 311; 320;

---

[1] See Durham, p. 40 ff.

[2] Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, counts only 16 instances of this usage in Plautus.   In reality there are 41.   Full material in Durham, op. cit. p. 40 ff.

501; 769; 1042; Ad. 381, fac macerentur; 511; 512; 813; H. T. 28, facite aequi sitis; Eun. 506, domi adsitis facite; Ad. 24, facite aequanimitas poetae augeat industriam; Pacuv. 208, fac hanc operam mihi des; 281; Stat. 290, fac velis; Turp. 146, fac potiar; Enn. (Frag), 529, 7, fac emas; Cato, Agr. 5, 7, opera omnia mature conficias face; 26, fac extergeantur; 31, 1; 32, 1; 37, 5; 161, 4.[1]

Perfect: Aul. 273, curata fac sint; Amph. 971, parata fac sint omnia; 979, fac commentus sis; 981, haec curata sint fac sis; Most. 400, aedes iam fac occlusae sint; Pseud. 190, fac sis delatum huc mihi frumentum; Capt. 736, in lapicidinas facite deductus siet; Men. 867, facite inflexa sit pedum pernicitas; 992, facite ablatus sublimen siet. Morris (Independent Subjunctive in Plautus, p. 165) takes these perfects (with the exception of Amph. 979) as presents; without good reason, as it seems to me. See below, p. 242, for further examples of the perfect in substantive clauses.

b) Following *facito, faciunto, facitote* (40):[2] Asin. 238, syngraphum facito adferas; Cas. 523, facitodum colas; Most. 216, hoc unum facito cogites; Pers. 445, facito mulier ad me transeat; Poen. 1084, facito sis reddas; 1278; 1414; 1418; Pseud. 166, glandium sumen facito in aqua iaceant; Rud. 1219, tua filia facito oret; Stich. 47, memineris facito; Trin. 485, semper tu hoc facito cogites; Men. 866, facitote sonitus ungularum appareat. A single instance of the perfect occurs in Bacch. 96, facito opsonatum nobis sit opulentum opsonium; H. T. 550, facitodum eadem memineris; Ad. 500, hoc tu facito cum animo cogites; 808; Titin. 169, facito exvibrisses; 172; Cato, Agr. 25, facito studeas; 26, facito habeas; 41, 3, facito coniungas; 41, 4; 43, 1; 46, 2; 55; 69, 2; 71 (bis); 76, 3; 77; 87 (bis); 101; 108, 1; 143, 1; CIL, i, 197, 10, facito ioudicetur; ibid. 11, bona eius possideantur facito; 198, 15, facito recitentur; 23, facito iouret; so 44; 57, facito possideantur; 200, 28, faciunto pateant.

c) With *faciam:* Amph. 63, faciam sit tragicomoedia; 876, faciam res fiat palam; M. G. 1398, ut faciam pendeant crepundia.

d) With *faxo* (18): Amph. 589, faxo ista expetant mendacia; 972; Asin. 876, faxo ipsum hominem manufesto opprimas; Bacch.

---

[1] Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, following Holtze, reckons only 3 instances of *fac* with the simple subjunctive in Cato.

[2] Blase, Hist. Lat. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 251, counts only 4 instances of this usage for Plautus. In reality there are 14 instances.

864, faxo haud dicat; Curc. 587, faxo reperias; Men. 113; 540; 644; Most. 68, aliquis faxo ad villam adferat; 1133; Pseud. 949; Trin. 62; 882; Truc. 643; Ad. 209, accipiat faxo; 847; with the perfect: Phor. 1028, faxo sit mactatus; Afran. 67, mitem faxo faciant fustibus.

     e) With *faxim* — only in Plautus — (7): Amph. 511, faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis; Aul. 494, faxim muli sint viliores; Merc. 826, faxim plures sint vidui; Pers. 73, faxim nusquam appareat; Trin. 221; Truc. 62 a; 348.

     f) With other forms of *facio:* Amph. 632, utinam di faxint infecta dicta re eveniant tua; Cato, Agr. 20, 2, faciat habeat; Titin. 103, me facit festinem.

    2) With *ut* (230).

     a) With *fac, facite* (47):[1] Amph. 978, fac Amphitruonem ut abigas; 981; Asin. 824, fac ut illi turbas concias; Capt. 337, fac is homo ut redimatur; Cas. 714, face ut impetres; Men. 948, ad me face ut deferatur; 1014; Most. 1145, fac ut tu meam timeas vicem; Pers. 526; Poen. 422, fac ut hunc lenonem perdam; Pseud. 210; 696 c; Rud. 698, fac ut ulciscare; 1088; 1218; Trin. 800; Truc. 478; with the perfect: Asin. 90, face id ut paratum sit; Poen. 580, fac modo ut condocta tibi sint dicta (with present perfect force); Cas. 746, facite cenam mihi ut ebria sit; Curc. 314, facite ut gaudeam; M. G. 1395, facite inter terram atque caelum ut sit; Most. 78; Pers. 92, collyrae facite ut madeant; Poen. 1390; Pseud. 163; 177; Stich. 65; 309, fores facite ut pateant; And. 408, fac apud te ut sies; 483; 712, fac ut venias; H. T. 84, fac me ut sciam; 592; Eun. 281, fac ut admittar; 362; Eun. 815, fac ut memineris; Phor. 671; 784; Hec. 764; 47, facite ut sit; Acc. 114, facite gratum ut sit; Titin. 130, facite in suo quique loco ut sita sint; Lucil. 616, face dignam me ut vobis putem; Cato, Agr. 23, 1, fac ut parentur.

     b) With *facito* (40):[2] Aul. 257, illud facito ut memineris; so also Curc. 210; Bacch. 327; M. G. 354; Pseud. 515; Bacch. 36,

---

    [1] Blase, Hist. Gramm. iii, 1, p. 250, reports the instances of *fac ut* in Plautus as 7. In reality there are 29. Following Holtze, Blase (ibid.) gives the instances of the same usage occurring in Cato as 3. But in 2 of the 3 examples cited by Holtze there is no authority for the *ut*. The only instance I have discovered in Cato is Agr. 23, 1, fac ut parentur.

    [2] Blase reports 15 instances of this usage for Plautus and 14 for Cato. The correct figures are 20 and 17 respectively.

facito ut subvenias; 1153; Cist. 62; Capt. 689; Cas. 524, facito ut
veniant; Curc. 213; Cist. 64; Men. 437, facito ut venias; so M. G.
1177; Merc. 279, facito ut nunties; 278; 565, facito ut cogites; so
also Stich. 519; Pers. 388; Stich. 148, facito ut sciam; Hec. 769, ut
sit facito; Ad. 845, facito ut serves; Titin. 23, facito ut multetur
malo; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, aratra facito uti habeas; 8, 2, facito uti
serantur; 23, 3, facito uti pendeat; 25, facito uti servetur; 31; 32,
1, facito uti ducas; 32, 2; 33, 1; 42, facito ut conveniat; 48, 2; 69,
1, facito ut suppleas; 70, 2; 85; 90; 141, 4; 151, 4, facito uti addas;
facito uti purges.

     c) With other forms of *facio* (115).

     Present indicative (15), e.g. Cist. 645, ut vivam facis; Rud.
244, facis ut velim: H. T. 58, facit ut moneam; Phor. 766; Hec.
211, inimici ut sint facis; 275, faciunt ut videamur; Stat. 233, facis
ut velim.

     Future indicative (53), e.g. Amph. 1085, faciam ut praedices;
Capt. 856, faciam ut cupias; Curc. 691, faciam ut accubes; M. G.
661, ut fateare faciam; Poen. 372, faciet ut sis civis Attica; Rud.
1084; And. 701, faciam ut credat; Eun. 309, faciam ut cognoscas;
801; Phor. 776. There is one instance of the perfect, Men. 1061,
facietis ut abstulerim.

     Perfect indicative (17), e.g. Aul. 797, quem avom feci ut
esses; Capt. 931, fecisti ut possim; M. G. 1257; And. 603, feci ut
fierent; Hec. 36, fecere ut exirem; 121; CIL, i, 551, feci ut cederent.

     Future perfect indicative: Phor. 430, feceris ut amici
simus; Cato, Agr. 139, fecerit uti id recte factum siet.

     Present subjunctive (7), e.g. Aul. 545, di faciant ut siet;
M. G. 346; Poen. 489; CIL, i, 196, 30, faciatis utei dismota sient.

     With *faxo, faxim:* Asin. 897, faxo ut scias; Pseud. 923 e,
ita ille faxit Iuppiter ut adsiet.

     Infinitives (15), e.g. Pers. 414, possum te facere ut argentum
accipias; Poen. 442, si nequeo facere ut abeas; Hec. 774, facere ut
redeat; Cato, Agr. 133, 3; Curc. 555, quid refert me fecisse ut oboe-
dirent; H. T. 396, fecisse ut compararem; Most. 423, facturum ut
fugiat; Ad. 750, facturum ut habeas.

     Opus est facto, usus est facto: Merc. 566, opus hoc facto
existumo, ut eam; Rud. 398, usus factost ut eam intro.

An instance of *nisi ut* following *faciam* occurs, Merc. 712, quid nunc faciam nisi ut adeam atque adloquar?

3) With *ne.* This form is rare, the idea being usually expressed by a prohibitive subjunctive or by *cave* with the subjunctive. The examples are: Most. 1145, fac ego ne metuam; 389, ita patrem faciam tuom non modo ne intro eat; Cist. 523, faxint ne ego oppingam (Schoell's conjecture; the MSS. have a lacuna) vivos savium; Poen. 908, ita di faxint ne apud lenonem hunc serviam; Hec. 839, fecisse ne eveniret; Acc. 88, facit ne dubitem.

4) With *ut ne,* Most. 423, facturum ut ne etiam aspicere aedis audeat; M. G. 149, eumque ita faciemus ut, quod viderit, ne viderit.

Most scholars have regarded these substantive clauses with *ne* and *ut ne* after *facio* as consecutive in character, but it seems methodically much sounder to regard them as purely formal extensions of the type *fac cures,* etc. Logically, to be sure, the dependent clause denotes a result, but so it does in *fac cures* and similar expressions. In three passages (Most. 389; Poen. 909; M. G. 149) we find *ita* in the main clause, but *ita* here is not a particle of intensity, but is used merely to anticipate the dependent clause; cf. my Critique, p. 10; Durham, p. 49. Yet *facio* does also at times take a genuine substantive clause of result. This, however, is rare; see below, p. 299.

With *Efficio, Perficio,* and Similar Verbs.

These verbs mean 'to succeed in one's effort,' and bear the same relation to *fac* that *persuadeo* bears to *suadeo;* or *exoro* to *oro;* see above, p. 219. The subjunctive clause with *efficio* and *perficio,* therefore, arises by analogy; for while *linguam compescas face* was undoubtedly originally paratactic, 'hold your tongue! mind you do!' it seems unnatural so to explain, e.g. Asin. 103, perficito ut habeat. This and similar expressions, therefore, are purely formal extensions of *facio* with the subjunctive. The material under this head is not extensive. It is as follows:

perficio: Asin. 103, perficito argentum hodie ut habeat filius; Eun. 21, perfecit sibi ut inspiciundi esset copia; 1055, perfice hoc ut haeream in parte aliqua apud Thaidem; Hec. 20, perfeci ut spectarentur; Lucil. 543, hau perficiam ut me amare expediat; CIL, i, 33, Mors perfecit tua ut essent omnia brevia; 542, perficias ut faciat.

efficio: Most. 416, efficiam ut liqueant omnia.

The influence of these verbs seems to be responsible for the employ-ment of the subjunctive with the following verbs also: And. 389, reddes omnia incerta ut sient; Most. 706, exsequi certa res est ut abeam; Amph. 1055, videntur omnia consequi ut opprimar; Cas. 701, perpetrem ut nubat mihi; Pers. 237, numquam exterebrabis tu ut sis peior quam ego siem; Cato, Agr. 114, 1, vinum si voles concin-nare ut alvom bonam faciat; Stich. 746, repperit odium ocius sua inmunditia quam in perpetuom ut placeat munditia sua. In And. 334, we have *efficere qui* used instead of *efficere ut:* efficite qui detur.

6. With *curo* and expressions of striving.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause with *curo* and expressions of striving is seen in Cato, Agr. 73, bibant curato, lit. 'let them drink; see to it! Cf. ibid. 143, 1, curato faciat.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*. Besides the passages above cited, the only instances seem to be Bacch. 550, ille accuratum habuit quod posset mali faceret; Cael. Antip. p. 102, 35 (Peter), curabo tibi cena sit cocta.

2) With *ut* (70).

curo (29): M. G. 1, curate ut splendor meo sit clipeo; Most. 208, istuc ⟨cures⟩ ut ille amet; Pers. 527, cura ut curetur; Pseud. 72, ut scires curavi; Rud. 193; Stich. 679; Trin. 1105; Phor. 905, curavi hoc ut esset fides; 830; Cato, Agr. 2, 5, curare uti perficiantur; 5, 4.

accuro: M. G. 165, adcuratote ut agitent convivium; Trin. 78.

contendo: Acc. 369, contendam ut habeam.

id ago: Trin. 699, id agis ut effugias; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, id egerunt ut vos potius doleatis quam ego ingemiscerem.

nitor (3): Merc. 111, nitere erus ut servetur; Most. 128; Lucil. 439.

studeo (6): Poen. 575, lenonem ut perdas, id studes; H. T. 382, id studuisti ut mores forent; Hec. 262; Ad. 868; Capt. Arg. 4, studens ut recuperet; Cato, Agr. 5, 8, stude ut habeas.

adnitor: Amph. 13, adnitier lucrum ut vobis suppetat.

festino: Trin. 615, quid festinet sentio, ut evortat Lesbonicum.

tento: Acc. 66, tenta (tanta, *codd.*) ut protrahas.

experior: Most. 237, ut sim parcus experiri.

[1] Durham, p. 50.

incipio: Ad. 238, hoc incipere ut postulet.

operam do (addo) (20) : Poen. 1204, addunt operam ut pla-
ceant; Cas. 16, verum ut cognoscant dabimus operam; Trin. 860,
dabo operam ut sentiat; And. 243, operam dat ut abstrahat; Eun. 63,
des operam ut insanias; Phor. 760.

rem gero: M. G. 577, scio quam rem gerat: ut comprehendar.

After the analogy of substantive clauses with *curo*, we find similar
clauses dependent on the noun *cura* and other nouns of related mean-
ing.   Thus:

cura (4): Stich. 652, curaest ut videam; M. G. 41; Aul.
364.

dolus: Capt. 47, confinxerunt dolum ut maneat.

fallacia (3): Poen. 774, compositast fallacia ut eo me privent;
Pseud. 1193.

sycophantia (3): Bacch. 740, sycophantias componit ut auferat;
M. G. 767.

fabrica: Poen. 1099, hanc fabricam apparo ut te allegemus.

astutia: M. G. 237, hanc astutiam ut dicam.

techina: Bacch. 392, techinam fecit ut mihi copia esset.

tela: Bacch. 350, haec tela ut copem facerem filium.

We find also the adjective *diligens*: Amph. 630, memor sum et
diligens ut compareant.

Qui = *ut* occurs in the following: M. G. 768, sycophantiam qui
admutiletur miles; 138, machinas qui facerem; Trin. 688.

3) With *ne* (12): Curc. 30, curato ne sis intestabilis; 138;
Bacch. 1030, ne perierem cura; Phor. 713, curabo ne duit; Hec. 227;
738, ne faciam adcuro; Ad. 710, magnam inicit curam ne faciam;
Cas. 772, ei rei dant operam, ne cenet senex; Pers. 372; And. Alt.
Ex. 2, operam dedi ne dicas.

4) With *ut ne:* Trin. 688, prospicere ut inops ne siem ; Hec.
595, haec nunc curast maxuma ut ne quoi mea longinquitas aetatis
obstet.

5) With *qui ne* = *ut ne:* And. 335, id agam qui ne detur.

6) *Ut neque . . . neque*: H. T. 964, cepi rationem ut neque
egeres neque posses perdere.

7. With *Vide, Videto,* ' see to it,' etc.[1]

1 Durham, p. 52.

a) ORIGIN.   The origin of substantive clauses with *vide, videto,* is seen in such expressions as Asin. 755, scribas, vide; Amph. 629, vide ex navi efferantur; Most. 558 (549 a), videto ut capias.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut.* This is found only in Plautus (3).   Besides Amph. 629 and Asin. 755 already cited above, we find: Poen. 578, vide sis calleas.

2) With *ut* (13): Truc. 711, vide ut tu tuom item efficias; Pers. 607, in proelium vide ut ingrediare; M. G. 1397, vide ut istic tibi sit acutus culter; Aul 614, vide ut auferam; Most. 558, videto ut capias : And. 735, ut subservias vide; Acc. 313, quam ut serves vide; Afran. 177, vide ut puellam curent; Cato, Agr. 9, id videto uti opus siet; 60, videto ut seras; 76, 4; 84; with perfect: Hec. 841, vide ut mi haec certa attuleris.

3) With *ne* (24): Capt. 584, vide nequid insistas; Curc. 325, vide ne me ludas; M. G. 1279, vide ne sies in exspectatione; Poen. 358, vide ne pectas; Pseud. 663; 942, vide ne titubes; Bacch. 201, vide nequis tractet; 744; M. G. 983, ne amittam vide modo; Pers. 28, vide ne transfigant; 383, videto ne faciat.   Perfect: Most. 966, vide ne devorteris atque biberis; Pseud. 1096, vide modo ne illic sit con-techinatus quippiam.   H. T. 212, vide ne abeas; 352; 369, vide ne ruas; Eun. 380, vide ne nimium calidum hoc sit; Phor. 803, vide ne pecces; Hec. 484, vide ne insistas; Ad. 550, vide ne inruat; Acc. Praet. 32, vide ne gerat; Afran. 186, ne requiram te vide; Cato, Agr. 1, 5, videto sumptuosus ager ne sit; 107, 2, videto ne aduras.

c) RANGE OF USE.   The usage is confined almost entirely to combinations with the imperatives *vide, videto.*   There is one instance of an equivalent jussive, viz. Cato, Agr. 5, 5, videat clausa uti siet; also five instances of *videndumst:* Epid. 37, videndumst ut suppetat; Most. 412; H. T. 694, videndumst amici res in tuto ut con-locetur;[1] Hec. 729, videndumst ne impetrem.   Other forms are: And. 456, ut fiant videro; Phor. 622, quor non vides ut conponamus? H. T. 670, nisi aliquid video, ne resciscat.   *Provideo* occurs Phor. 779, provisum est ne abeat.

---

[1] H. T. 689 reads amici res est videnda in tuto ut conlocetur. If Terence wrote *videnda* and not *videndum* (as in the same expression in 694), it is a purely formal attraction due to the proximity of *res.*

8. With *Cave, Caveto*, etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. With Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 379) and Delbrück (Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 420), I regard *cave facias*, etc., as a purely analogical phenomenon. Just as the Romans said: *fac abeas*, 'see that you go away!' so also they came to say by analogy: *cave abeas*,[2] 'avoid going away!' 'don't go away!' In expressions of the type, *cave ne cadas*, we have an originally paratactic prohibitive.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*. Here we have both the present and perfect subjunctive. The perfect in such case always refers to the future, never to the past. It is slightly commoner[3] than the present. Where *ut* is absent, the governing verb is almost exclusively restricted to the forms: *cave, cavete, caveto*. The only exceptions I have noted are: Cas. 902, cavebunt faciant; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, caveat quam minimum in cellam introeatur, where, however, *caveat = videat*.

a) Present Tense (31): Bacch. 1033, cave tibi cc nummi dividiae fuant; Capt. 431, cave tu mi iratus fuas; 439, cave fidem fluxam geras; Curc. 461; Cas. 530, cave tu in quaestione mihi sis; 902; Epid. 437, cave praeterbitas ullas aedis; Most. 810; 1025; Pers. 51; 816, cave sis me attigas; so Acc. 304; Rud. 704. In Poen. 117, cave dirumpatis, we even have the plural after *cave*. And. 403, cave sentiat; H. T. 1031, cave audiam; 1032; Phor. 764, cave resciscat; 993; Ad. 170; Naev. Trag. 36, cave sis contendas; Stat. 116, decolles cave; Incert. vaticin. Baehrens, Frag. p. 35, cave sinas; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, caveto alienam disciplinam temere contemnas; 28, caveto effodias aut feras; 34, 1; 66, 1; Aul. 660, cave sis te videam; Stich. 37, cave sis audiam istuc; Naev. Com. 82; Acc. 456, cave lassitudo cursum levet.

b) Perfect Tense (38): Amph. 608, cave quicquam mihi responderis; Asin. 256, cave tu idem faxis; so also: 625; M. G. 1125; 1245; 1372; Most. 808; Truc. 943; H. T. 187; Naev. Com. 47; Asin. 467, cave supplicassis; Aul. 90, cave quemquam in aedis intromiseris; 608, cave quoiquam indicassis; 618, cave tu illi fidelis fueris; Bacch. 910, cave parsis in eum dicere; 1188, quod di dant cave culpa tua amissis; 402, cave sis te superare servom siris; so Epid. 400; Most.

---

[1] Durham, p. 54 ff.

[2] For other explanations of origin, see Durham, p. 54 f.

[3] Not "bedeutend häufiger," as stated by Blase, Hist. Gramm der lat. Spr., iii, 1, p. 254.

401; Cas. 332, tu istos cave deos flocci feceris; so also M. G. 1368;
Poen. 1023; Stich. 285; Trin. 513; Men. 994, cave quisquam vostrum
flocci fecerit; Cas. 404, cave (Bothe's conj. for *ne* of the MSS.) obiexis
manum; Cist. 300, cave tu umquam bellum sumpseris; Epid. 439,
cave ad me rettuleris pedem; Merc. 113, cave pigritiae praevorteris;
484, cave tu istuc dixis; so also Vid. 83; Most. 523, cave respexis;
Pers. 389, cave sis tu istuc dixeris; so also Trin. 555; Ad. 458; Vid.
91, cave demutassis; And. 760, cave excessis; H. T. 826, cave admi-
ratus sis.

   2) *Caveo ne* (60).

      a) With *cave, caveto* (24): Amph. 845, cave sis ne tu te per-
duis; Asin. 372, caveto ne suscenseas; Aul. 584, cave ne tu inmutas-
sis nomen; Most. 324, cave ne cadas; 326; Pseud. 1296; Trin. 1011;
H. T. 302, cave ne studeas; Eun. 751, cave ne, prius quam hanc ac-
cipias, amittas; Acc. 191, cave ne implices; Afran. 279, cave ne pen-
deas; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, cave ne ares neve impellas; 20, 2, caveto ne
sint; 32, 2, caveto ne praecipites et ne praestringas; 37, 4, caveto doles
neu cadas neu tangas; 38, 2; ibid. neve noctu neve ullo tempore inter-
mittatur caveto; 38, 4; 40, 2; 45, 2; 49, caveto ne saucies; 53; 161,
2; 161, 4; 162, 2; 31, 2.

      b) With other forms of *caveo* (35), e.g. Aul. 101, ne intromit-
tatur cavet; Capt. 255; Bacch. 544; H. T. 235, caves ne videat; Asin.
373, cavebis ne me attingas; Merc. 189, quin cavisti ne eam videret?
And. 444, cavit ne esset; Rud. 378; Merc. 958; Men. 270, cavero ne
tu delinquas neve ego irascar; Pseud. 478; 128, a me ut caveant ne
credant mihi; Stich. 121; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, caveat ne tollat; 67, 2;
22, 1; Amph. 944, primum cavisse oportuit ne diceres; Hec. 470,
cavisse ne ulla contumelia fieri posset; Capt. 253, ne in quaestione
essemus cautum intellego; Merc. 466, ne hic resciscat cauto opus
est; Most. 902.

      c) With *cautio, cautior:* Bacch. 597, cautiost ne nucifrangi-
bula excussit ex malis meis; Poen. 445, mihi cautiost ne obiexim
moram; Pseud. 170; And. 400, ne resciscat cautiost; Ad. 421;
Pseud. 298, cautiores sunt ne credant alteri.

   In expressions of the type *cave facias*, we noted that the perfect
tense is slightly commoner than the present. In expressions of the
type *caveo ne*, the perfect is extremely rare, the only instances I have

noted being Aul. 584; Poen. 445; Bacch. 597.   The governing verb
is not restricted to the imperative (as in case of *cave facias, cave
feceris*), but we more often find other forms, as *cavere, cavet, cavero,
cavistis.*   See the examples cited above.   By analogy we find also
cautio est (Pseud. 170) and *cautior* (Pseud. 298) followed by a *ne*
clause.   Peculiar is Men. 785, edixi ut caveres neuter ad me iretis.

As regards meaning, there seems a slight difference between *cave*
and *cave ne ; cave* with the simple subjunctive always conveys a pro-
hibition ; *cave ne*, sometimes at least, expresses genuine concern or
solicitude, e.g. Most. 324, cave ne cadas; 326; Amph. 845; Trin.
1011.

3) *Caveo ni:* CIL, 200, 6, exceptum cavitumque est nei divi-
deretur; Most. 924, ausim non cavere ni quid committam tibi ?

4) *Caveo ut.*   Of this the following examples occur : Bacch. 42,
qui caveat ut se revehat domum; cf. 44 ; Capt. 225, cauto opus est ut
hoc sobrie agatur; Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 132, lege cavit vitia uti
transcenderent auctoris poenae.   But *cave* here has the force of ' see
to it,' not, as in the foregoing material, of ' avoid,' ' guard against.'

For a discussion of the untenable theory that *cave, cave ne* with
the perfect are more energetic than *cave, cave ne* with the present, see
Elmer, Amer. Jour. Phil. xv, 133 ff. ; Bennett, Critique, p. 48 ff.

9. Verbs of Permitting, Granting, Allowing.[1]

a) ORIGIN.   The origin of substantive clauses with verbs of per-
mitting is indicated by And. 895, age dicat; sino (probably paratac-
tic); cf. Ad. 996, sino; habeat.   With *licet:* Phor. 347, ludas licet;
originally, ' play ! you may ;' i.e. ' you may play.'

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (65).   This is the commonest form, being very
frequent with *sino* and *licet* in Early Latin.   With *licet, ut* is never
used in Early Latin, and with *sino* but once : Hec. 590, neque sinam
ut dicat.   With *sino* the imperative (*sine, sinito, sinite*) is practically
the unvarying form of the verb when governing a substantive clause
in Early Latin.   The only exceptions are Hec. 590 (just cited) and
M. G. 54, sivi viverent.   Examples :

sino (48): *sine :* Asin. 460, sic sine astet; Cas. 206, sine quod
lubet id faciat; 206, sine amet; 437, sine modo rus veniat; M. G.

[1] Durham, p. 60 ff.

1244; H. T. 1050, sine te exorent; Eun. 185; 283, sine praetereat; 739, sine veniat; Hec. 744, sine dicam; Ad. 815; Stat. 72, sine nictentur; 73; *sinite;* M. G. 1084, sinite abeam; Hec. 10, sinite sim; *sinito* (only in Cato); Cato, Agr. 24, sinito distabescat; 91, sinito combibat; so 109; 91 sinito arescat; so 116; 92; 95, 2; 96.

licet (15): Capt. 303, laedat licet; Epid. 471, habeas licet; Merc. 989, habeat licet; Most. 713, incusses licet; Rud. 139, sis licet; Trin. 1179, et tute item videas licet; Asin. 718, licet laudem Fortunam; Phor. 347, ludas licet; Naev. 127; Stat. 50, liceat legant; Titin. 27, nec licet fullonibus quiescant; Lucil. 60, licet erret; Cato, Agr. 83, licebit faciat; 158, 2, licebit bibas; 161, 3, usque licebit vellas.

concedo, do: Amph. 11, concessum et datum nuntiis praesim.

2) With *ut* (29). This usage is relatively rare with verbs, but is common with nouns. Examples: ·

sino: Hec. 590, neque sinam ut dicat.

concedo: Hec. 258, haud tibi hoc concedo ut velis.

do: Eun. 395, est istuc datum ut grata sint; And. Alter Ex. 10, ut obsequerer dedit.

mitto: Amph. 546, mitto uti cedas.

patior: Epid. 148, patierin ut ego me interimam? In the classical period *patior* regularly takes an *ut*-clause only when accompanied by a negative (*non patior*).

committo (5): Aul. 450, neque committam ut siet; Bacch. 1037, haud committam ut dicas; Stich. 640; Ad. 159, non umquam committam ut vapulet; Lucil. 560, committit ut pereat.

nihil interdico: Capt. 694, nihil interdico aiant vivere.

After the analogy of verbs of permitting, several nouns denoting permission, opportunity, etc., also take an *ut*-clause. Thus:

copia (5): M. G. 769, hanc ecficiamus copiam ut abducat; Pers. 255.

potestas (5): Capt. 934, di eam potestatem dabunt ut muneres; H. T. 35, date potestatem ut liceat; 721.

occasio (5): Bacch. 673, occasio fuit ut sumeres; Epid. 645, non habeo ullam occasionem ut fabuler.

spatium (2): And. 623, spatium ut sumam; Hec. 130, spatium solitudinis ut conloqui posset.

ansa: Pers. 671, quaerere ansam infectum ut faciat.

3) With *qui* (= *ut*) and the subjunctive: Trin. 135, nec qui de-
terior esset faceres copiam; Vid. 87, qui vivam copiam facis.

10. With Verbs of Deciding, Resolving, etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The starting-point of this usage may very well have
been the employment of the subjunctive of determined resolution
(see p. 161) in expressions originally paratactic, e.g. profestos fes-
tos habeam: hoc decrevi, 'I'm bound to regard; that's what I've
determined to do.' Starting thus in the first person, the usage might
then easily extend itself to other persons, and then to nouns denoting
' decision,' ' resolve,' etc.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (9): Poen. 501, profestos festos habeam, decre-
tumst mihi; Asin. 248, certumst sumam faenore; Amph. 1048, cer-
tumst intro rumpam in aedis; Cas. 448, certumst hunc praemittam;
Bacch. 382, certumst iam dicam patri; Aul. 681, certumst malam
rem potius quaeram cum lucro; Capt. 778, nunc certa res est
coniciam in collum pallium; Amph. 635, dis est placitum plus mali
adsit.

In view of Merc. 472, certumst ibo atque dabo, the subjunctive
is uncertain in most of the above examples; yet with Durham (p. 84)
and Morris (Amer. Jour. Phil. xviii, p. 145) I am inclined to
regard the ambiguous forms as subjunctive.

In Men. 1058, certissimumst mepte potius fieri servom quam
te emittam, we have an instance of this subjunctive after *quam*.

2) With *ut* (16).

paro: M. G. 295, ut pereas paratumst.

comparo: Phor. 41, comparatumst ut addant; Afran. 117,
comparatumst uno ut simus contentae viro.

statuo: M. G. 727, statuit ut veneat.

constituo: Pseud. 549, ut irem constitueram.

visum est: Phor. 619, visumst mi ut temptarem.

voveo: Hec. 434, vovisse hunc dicam ut me rumperet. For
the later period I have discovered only one similar example, Justin,
xxi, 3, 2, voverant ut virgines suas prostituerent.

placitum est: Amph. 635, divis est placitum voluptatem ut
maeror consequatur.

[1] Durham, p. 63 ff.; 83 f.

animatus sum: Asin. 505, an ita tu's animata ut qui matris expers imperi sies?

animus ('resolve'): Aul. 371, volui animum confirmare ut bene haberem me; so Capt. 242.

sententia: Aul. 383, accessit animus ad meam sententiam ut nuptum darem; Curc. 217, sententiam ut qui me nili faciat nec salvom velit.

consilium: Most. 1049, capio consilium ut senatum convocem.

sors ('doom'): Cas. 300, mihi optinget sors. :: ut quidem pereas.

3) With *ne:* Curc. 704, dum quidem iudices ne quisquam argentum auferat; M. G. 725, aequom fuit deos paravisse uno exemplo ne omnes vitam viverent.

4) With *uti ne:* Cato, Agr. 1, 1, sic in animo habeto, uti ne emas, neve parcas, et ne satis habeas.

11. With *potin*, etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The original meaning in expressions like *potin abeas* (Pers. 297) was 'Go away! Can't you?' So Poen. 916, potin ut taceas, 'Just hush! Can't you?' Pers. 175, potin ne moneas.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut*, only in Plautus, Pers. 297, potin abeas; Cas. 731, potin a med abeas.

2) With *ut* (17): Bacch. 751, potin ut cures; so Merc. 495; Pseud. 235; Pers. 175, potin ut taceas; so Poen. 916; Pseud. 940; 942; Men. 466, potin ut quiescas; Merc. 890, potin ut animo sis tranquillo; Most. 396, potin ut animo sis quieto; Amph. 903, potin ut abstineas manum; so Rud. 424; Trin. 628, potin ut sinas; Pseud. 263, potin ut huc respicias; 393, potin ut abeas; M. G. 926, potin ut hominem mihi des; Ad. 539, potin ut desinas; Afran. 202, potin ut dicta facessas.

3) With *ne:* only Pers. 175, potin ne moneas.

4) With *ut ne* (8): only in Plautus and chiefly in the phrase *potin ut molestus ne sis,* viz. Epid. 63; Cist. 465; Men. 627; Merc. 779; Pers. 287; Truc. 897; Bacch. 751, potin ut ne parcas mihi; Merc. 441, potin ut ne licitere.

Besides *potin,* we find also *potis est ut:* Bacch. 35, potis est ut

[1] Durham, p. 69 f.

taceas; Eun. 263, si potis est ut parasiti Gnathonici vocentur.
Also *potest ut ne:* Pseud. 633, potest ut alii arbitrentur et ut ne
credam tibi; and *fieri potest ne, ut ne:* Poen. 1251, si id fieri possit,
ne indigna indignis di darent; Ad. 626, fieri potis est ut ne qua
exeat? And. 699, si poterit fieri ut ne pater credat. These last I
regard as purely formal extensions of the common type, *potin ut ne.*
Expressions of the general type under discussion are practically con-
fined to Plautus (30). Terence has but 4 examples; Afran. 1.

12. With *Optumum Est, Aequom Est, Oportet, Decet, Tempus Est,* etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The origin of substantive clauses with the above
expressions is indicated by such passages as Aul. 567, optumum est
loces; Most. 724, sic decet, morem geras; Cato, Agr. 14, 1, haec
faciat oportet; Pacuv. 32, et aequom et rectum est quod postulas :
iurati cernant. Cf. also Cato, Agr. 5, 1, haec erunt vilici officia: dis-
ciplina bona utatur; feriae serventur.

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (11).

optumum est (4): Asin. 448, adeam optumumst; Aul. 567 (cited
above); Men. 947, scin quid faciam optumumst? Rud. 377, capillum
promittam optumumst.

melius est (3): Merc. 497, meliust sanus sis (the reading of
A, followed by Lindsay). Also with *quam,* viz. Men. 832, quid mihi
meliust quam med adsimulem insanire? Rud. 328, quid mihi melius
est quam hic opperiar erum?

oportet: only Cato, Agr. 14, 1 (cited above) and 21, 5, idem
trapetum oportet accommodet. Elsewhere in Early Latin, *oportet*
takes the infinitive; see p. 393.

decet: besides Most. 724 (cited above) I have noted only
Poen. 21, decet animo aequo nunc stent.

2) With *ut* (23).

optumum est (3): Aul. 582, hoc mihi factust optumum, ut ted
auferam; Pseud. 185; Trin. 485, cogites id optumum esse tute uti
sis optumus.

tempus est: M. G. 72, videtur tempus esse ut eamus; 1101;
cf. H. T. 667, ita tempus fert ut cupiam (*fert* is Bentley's accepted
emendation for *est* of the MSS.).

[1] Durham, p. 71 ff.

melius est (4): Aul. 76, neque quicquam meliust quam ex me
ut unam faciam litteram; Pseud. 1121, neque quicquamst melius
quam ut hoc pultem; Rud. 220, quid mihi meliust quam a corpore
vitam ut secludam?   1189.

bonum est: Poen. 45, bonum factum quisque ut meminerit.

aequom: Rud. 1230, aequom videtur tibi ut dicam?

iustum est: Bacch. 994, iustum est ut serviat.

par videtur: Bacch. 139, non par videtur ut siet.

ex tua re est: Pseud. 336, ex tua re est ut ego emoriar; 338;
Aul. 154; cf. And. 546, in rem est ut fiant; Hec. 834.

ius: Aul. 747, si ius est ut istuc excusare possies.

officium (4): Pers. 616, scio ego officium ut eloquar; Most.
27; Pseud. 913; And. 168, tuomst officium has ut adsimules nup-
tias.   Cf. the use of *partis*, 'role' in Phor. 835; 836, with following
ut-clause.

3) With *ne:* only Aul. 587, servi facinus ('duty') frugi ne
morae molestiaeque imperium erile habeat.

13.   With *Opus Est, Usus Est, Necesse Est*.[1]

a) ORIGIN.   The origin of the substantive clause with these
expressions is illustrated by Lucretius, iii, 593, fateare, necesse est,
'You must admit;' originally, 'Admit! You must.'

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut:* only Poen. 1244, patronus sim necesse est;
Merc. 1004, nil opust resciscat, an analogical extension of *opus est
resciscat;* cf. *nolo abeas* after *volo abeas;* p. 216.

2) With *ut* (11).

opus est (5): Poen. 1421, hic opus est ut maneas; Truc. 328,
opus est ut lavem; 500, opust aegram ut te adsimules; Pseud. 740;
Phor. 204, opus est ut sis.

necesse est: Eun. 969, necesse est ut subveniam; Enn. Sat. 481.

usus est (4): M. G. 1132, nunc ad me ut veniat usust; Epid.
167, usust ut pudeat; Phor. 505, neque umquam usus venit ut
conflictares; H. T. 81.

14.   With Verbs of Hindering, Preventing, etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN.   We can only conjecture the original paratactic usage
that has given rise to the subjunctive with *ne* and *ut ne* after verbs

[1] Durham, p. 74 f.

of hindering.   Possibly the usage began in combination with impera-
tives, e.g. *eum prohibe; ne adveniat,* whence easily, 'prevent him
from coming.'

  b) FORM.

  1) With *ne* (10).

      prohibeo (4): Men. 794, prohibere ad cenam ne promittat
postules neu quemquam accipiat; Trin. 87, qui prohibere me potes
ne suspicer? Poen. 399; Eun. 808, tun me prohibeas ne tangam?

      deterreo (4): Truc. 929, hau deterrere potes ne amet; Phor.
3, deterrere ne scribat parat; Hec. 27.

      absterreo: Most. 420, ut absterreres ne intro iret.

      in manu est (involving the idea of preventing): Hec. 493,
tibi in manust ne fiat.

  In Most. 539, the idea of preventing is conveyed by *occurro* in
nisi quid occurro ne resciscat, 'unless I am beforehand with some-
thing to prevent his finding out.'

  2) With *ut ne:* only Trin. 104, est atque non est mihi in manu;
quin dicant, non est; merito ut ne dicant, id est; where *est mihi in
manu* involves the idea of preventing.

  3) With *qui ne:* only Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 140, haud facilest
defensu qui ne comburantur.

  4) With the simple subjunctive: Pseud. 206, prohibet faciant
quod nolint (bracketed by some editors).   Explanation is difficult.

  15. With Verbs of Deserving.[1]

  a) ORIGIN.   I quote from Durham, l.c.: "Apparently no genuine
instance is preserved of an original use of the substantive clause
with *mereo* and kindred verbs, but the jussive origin seems well
established by the occurrence of the negative *ne* (e.g. Men. 1100,
promeruisti ut nequid ores). . . .   Probably an original use would
be something like *hoc mihi dones; merui;* or *ut hanc coronam accipias;
meruisti;* i.e. 'just take this crown! you have earned it.'"   In sup-
port of this theory of origin, may be urged the fact that in the great
majority of cases of a substantive clause with verbs of deserving,
the governing verb is in the perfect.   But assuming that the con-
struction began in the way suggested, its extension to the present
would naturally follow.

[1] Durham, p. 75 f.

b) FORM.

   1) Without *ut:* no instance.

   2) With *ut* (14).

     mereo, mereor (10): Capt. 744, aliter ut dicam meres; Men. 359; Poen. 1407, ego te meruisse ut pereas scio; Hec. 760, meritus est ut commodem; Turp. 85, meres ut diligare.

     commereo: Hec. 580, commerui ut caperet.

     dignus sum: only M. G. 1140, non sum dignus ut figam palum in parietem.

     promereo: Epid. 442, promerui ut mihi omnis mortalis agere deceat gratias. Cf. also Pers. 496, tuom promeritumst ut faciam.

   3) With *ut ne:* Men. 1100, cited above under **a.**

16. With *Quid Est Quod; Nihil Est Quod;* etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. I quote from Durham, l.c.: "These expressions are a development of relative clauses of purpose.[2] . . . In accordance with this theory, *quid est quod metuas* originally meant, 'what is there for you to fear?' whence naturally, 'what reason is there for you to fear?' 'why is it that you fear?' To the Roman mind, *quod* apparently came to be felt as an interrogative conjunction. This paved the way for expressions of the type, *quid est quod abeas?* where *quod* obviously could not have been a pronoun, or the dependent clause one of purpose. These last are therefore secondary in origin and an extension of the original purpose type. That such clauses were distinctly felt as causal, seems clear, not merely from the context in which they occur, but also from the answer given in Amph. 502, quid istuc negoti est quod abeas?::haud quod tui me distaedeat."

b) RANGE OF USE.

   1) *Quid est quod* (10): Amph. 502; Capt. 541, quid istuc est quod meos te dicam fugitare oculos? Curc. 166, quid est quod voces Palinurum? Rud. 628, quid sit expedi ⟨quod tu⟩multues; 638; Poen. 867; H. T. 901, quid est quod amplius simuletur? Hec. 676.

   2) *Nihil est quod* (7); *non est quod:* Asin. 146, quod (quid, *codd.*) suscenseam ipsi nil est; so Phor. 361; Merc. 317, nil est quod tu mihi suscenseas; H. T. 175, nil est quod vereare; 834; Lucil. 257, non est quod quaeras neque labores; Capt. 741.

    [1] Durham, p. 77 f.   [2] A jussive development.

3) *Est quod* (6): Trin. 310, est quod gaudeas; 1166; Rud. 516, bonam est quod habeas gratiam; Merc. 502, tibi quod rideas magis est quam ut lamentere; Aul. 203; Hec. 741, est magnam gratiam quod tibi habeam.

4) *Nil scio quod:* Capt. 842, nil scio quod gaudeam.

To the same influence, probably, we should assign Aul. 92, ne causae quid sit quod te quisquam quaeritet.

17. Miscellaneous Expressions.[1]

a) With *memento:* Cas. 823, ut subdola sis, memento; Afran. 194, illud memento, ne quid imprudentius blateres.

b) *Restat:* Phor. 586, ut egrediar, id restat, 'it remains for me to go out;' Hec. 300, quid restat nisi ut fiam miser?

c) *Satis est:* Cato, Agr. 69, 2, tepeat satis est; Bacch. 491, satin ut nescias, also possibly belongs here.

d) Expressions of exempting and refraining: Trin. 293, hisce de artibus gratiam facio ne colas neve imbuas; M. G. 576, gratiam fecit ne iratus esset; Trin. 314, ne penetrarem, neu irem, neu parerem parsi; Stich. 117, ne id faciat temperat.

e) *Causa est:* Capt. 257, non iusta causa est ut vos servem? taken by Durham, l.c. as a negative interrogative extension of *ut serves; causa est,* 'just watch! there's reason for it.'

f) Note also the loose use of substantive *ut*-clauses, following *nisi:* Cas. 952, quid nunc agam nescio nisi ut famulos imiter; Most. 663; Trin. 718, quid ego nunc agam nisi ut sarcinam constringam? Eun. 74, quid agas? nisi ut te redimas quam minumo; Pseud. 1101, non edepol scio, nisi ut observemus quo eat.

PERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE USED WITH FUTURE FORCE IN SUBSTANTIVE
    CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE JUSSIVE AND PROHIBITIVE.

Just as in the case of independent volitive subjunctives, so also in their dependent use as substantive clauses, the perfect tense is occasionally used with future force in Early Latin. Thus: Trin. 520, dico ne siris; Aul. 99, praedico tibi ne intromiseris; Capt. 791, eminor interminorque nequis mihi obstiterit; Aul. 611, quaeso ut prohibessis; Capt. 319, optestor ne faxint; with *fac, facite,* we find the perfect only in deponents and passives, e.g. Amph. 979, fac com-

_____
[1] Durham, p. 77.

mentus sis; Pseud. 190, fac sit delatum mihi frumentum; Men. 992, facite ablatus siet; Capt. 736, facite deductus siet; Men. 867; Bacch. 96; Poen. 580; Asin. 90; Amph. 971; 981; Aul. 273; Most. 400. Frequently with *cave* (38),[1] e.g. Amph. 608, cave responderis; Aul. 90, cave intromiseris; 618, cave tu illi fidelis fueris; Cas. 332, cave feceris; Epid. 439, cave rettuleris; Merc. 113; cave praevorteris; Most. 401, cave siveris; Trin. 555, cave dixeris; H. T. 826, cave admiratus sis; Naev. Com. 47, cave faxis; *cave ne* only Aul. 584, cave ne immutassis nomen; Poen. 445, cautiost ne obiexim moram; Bacch. 597.

Besides these instances of the perfect referring to the future, the perfect is also employed as a true present perfect, e.g. Most. 966, vide ne devorteris; Pseud. 1096, vide ne sit contechinatus quidpiam; Hec. 841; M. G. 149; 187; but this use is rare.

Connecting Negatives in Substantive Clauses Developed from the Jussive and Prohibitive.

The connecting negative in these clauses is regularly *neve* (*neu*), viz. in Epid. 164, dicam ne hinc exambulet neve veniat; Bacch. 521, exorabo ne noceat neu quid ei suscenseat; 689, exoravi tibi ne noceat neu quid ob eam rem suscenseat; Men. 270, cavero ne tu delinquas neve ego irascar; 795; 1006, opsecro te operam mihi ut des neu sinas in me fieri tantam iniuriam; Amph. 1037, quaeso ut mi adsis neve abeas; Merc. 331, huic persuadere ut illam vendat neve det matri suae; Trin. 293, his de artibus gratiam facio ne colas neve imbuas ingenium; CIL, i, 196, 10, sacerdos nequis vir eset, neve pecuniam quisquam eorum comoinem habuise velet (repeated four times in the same paragraph); And. 291, te obtestor ne abs te hanc segreges neu deseras; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, sic in animo habeto uti ne cupide emas neve opera tua parcas visere et ne satis habeas semel circumire; 5, 6, terram cariosam cave ne ares neve plostrum neve pecus impellas; 31, 2; 37, 4; 38, 2; Frag. (Jord.), 22, 2, mihi curae est ne quid advorsi eveniat neve haec laetitia nimis luxuriose eveniat; Trin. 314; Ad. 798.

The only exceptions to the foregoing principle are: Curc. 218, sententiam ut qui me nili faciat nec salvom velit; Poen. 489, faciat ut semper sacruficem nec umquam litem; Hec. 729, videndumst ne impetrem aut ne quid faciam; H. T. 964, cepi rationem ut neque egeres

[1] Full material above, p. 232.

neque posses perdere; Most. 418; Hec. 595, curast ut ne longinquitas
aetatis obstet mortemve quis expectet. *Et ne:* Cato, Agr. 1, 1; 32, 2.

Absence of Introductory Particles in Subordinate Clauses.

Attention has been called above (p. 209 ff.) to the fact that many
of the subjunctives which I take as subordinate are by others re-
garded as independent. In fact all those instances of the subjunctive
without *ut* which I have classified above as "substantive clauses"
are by Morris[1] taken as independent uses. Against this attitude
there are serious objections.[2] Thus in the Amphitruo prologue, v. 8 ff.:

>Et uti bonis vos vostrosque omnis nuntiis
>Me adficere voltis, ea adferam, ea uti nuntiem,
>Quae maxume in rem vostram communem sient,

adferam is taken by Morris as independent. It is true that there is
no subordinating sign, but evidently *adferam* is logically identical
with the preceding infinitive *adficere* and the following *uti nuntiem,* —
'You wish me to bless you with good tidings, to bring you and to
announce to you things that make for your common good.' It is
clearly impossible, I think, to conceive *adferam* as possessing an
independent value here. The same is true of Amph. 11, vos quidem
id iam scitis concessum et datum mi esse ab dis aliis nuntiis praesim;
Asin. 644, istud facias quod faciamus nobis suades; Amph. 257,
velatis manibus orant ignoscamus peccatum suom. There is also
special difficulty in the case of imperfects like Stich. 177, hoc nomen
repperi eo quia paupertas fecit ridiculus forem. If *forem* be an inde-
pendent subjunctive, the first question is what it means. Who says
forem? Gelasimus (the speaker in the passage) cannot say it, and
it is equally impossible that a personified Paupertas should say it.
It must, therefore, I think, be clear that *forem* is not an independent
subjunctive, but a dependent one, — the object of *fecit,* — ' poverty
made me take to jesting.' Cf. also Stich. 624, dixi equidem in
carcerem ires; Trin. 591, tandem impetravi abiret; M. G. 54, at
peditastelli quia erant, sivi viverent. Here if we take *ires, abiret,* and
viverent as independent, we get a kind of subjunctive totally different
from anything else familiar to us. My explanation therefore is that

[1] Independent Subjunctive in Plautus; Principles and Methods in Syntax, p. 113 ff.
[2] For a fuller statement of these, see Bennett, Critique of Recent Subjunctive
Theories (Cornell Studies, ix, p. 66 ff.).

they are modelled on expressions like *dico eas ;* 'go, I tell you to ;' *sino, vivant,* 'let them live, I allow it.' Even in expressions of the latter type it seems necessary to recognize subordination, since a *dixi ires* would hardly have arisen until in *dico eas* the *eas* was felt as subordinate.

I pass to examples of which the following is a typical illustration: Merc. 107, eam me advexisse nolo resciscat pater; Pseud. 436, vetus nolo faciat; so also Cas. 233, nolo ames; Pers. 245 (full material at page 216). Now if we here take *ames* as independent, we get the astounding nonsense: 'love her; I don't want you to.' I have therefore above *loc. cit.* explained these expressions as modelled on *volo resciscat ; volo ames.* Cf. also Merc. 1004, nihil opust resciscat, which presumably follows the analogy of *opus est resciscat.*

If the explanation of *nolo ames* and *nihil opust resciscat* be correct, it involves conclusions of far-reaching importance. At the time when *nolo ames* came into existence in the way suggested, *ames* in *volo ames* must have already passed the stage of independence and have come to be felt as an object clause. So *nihil opust resciscat* could not have arisen until in *opus est resciscat* the *resciscat* had come to be felt as a dependent substantive clause.

But if this is so, one may well query whether any of the examples of so-called paratactic subjunctives in Plautus are anything more than vestiges of an original parataxis. It seems certain that, for the subjunctive, the paratactic stage had been passed centuries before Plautus, just as it had well-nigh disappeared in the Greek of Homer's day. A very few cases occur which may, perhaps, be vindicated as paratactic; but in the main it seems clear that for Plautus and Terence, as well as for Cicero and the later Latin, the great body of subjunctive expressions of the type claimed by Morris as independent (and paratactic) were really felt to be subordinate and dependent.[1]

[1] In his Principles and Methods, Morris replies to the strictures which I (in my Critique) had made upon the attitude above criticised. In this reply he shifts the ground to the question whether the subjunctives in controversy are properly to be called paratactic. But my criticism was not primarily intended to discuss the subject of the nature of parataxis. It was directed essentially to the discussion of the question whether the expressions involved were dependent or independent. I was constrained to decide in favor of their dependence. Whether dependence is consistent with parataxis (as ordinarily understood) is doubtful.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE DELIBERATIVE.[1]

A. With *Quin.*

a) ORIGIN. The origin of these clauses is indicated by Amph. 559, quin loquar, numquam me potes deterrere;[2] cf. Cic. Epist. ii, 17, 1, quin decedam, nulla causa est; literally, "Why shouldn't I speak? You can't stop me;" "Why shouldn't I withdraw? There's no reason." It is true that independent deliberatives introduced by *quin* are rare (see p. 183), but this circumstance is hardly of great significance in view of the many dependent *quin*-clauses that naturally lend themselves to this explanation.

In Classical Philology, iii, p. 408 ff., Fowler takes a different view of these *quin*-clauses, denying that *quin* ever had interrogative force, and explaining it as indefinite (= *qui* + -*ne*, asseverative). But Fowler's contention seems to ignore the Plautine *mirum quin ;* while it likewise involves the arbitrary conjecture of *quin* for *quia* in Merc. 191, as well as an unnatural interpretation in Stich. 576, quin vocasti hominem ad cenam? : : Nequid adveniens perderem.

b) RANGE OF USE. The substantive clause with *quin* developed from the deliberative occurs with :

nulla causa est, numquid causae est, etc. (16): Cas. 1003, nulla causa est quin verberes; And. 600, quid causae est quin proficiscar? Aul. 755, haud causificor quin eam habeam; Trin. 1188, numquid causae est quin uxorem ducam?

dubito (6): Poen. 881, quid dubitas quin faciat? Africanus Minor (Meyer), p. 213, eumne quisquam dubitet quin idem fecerit?

non (haud) dubium est (5, all in Terence): And. 530, haud dubiumst quin possim.

contineo (4): Rud. 1172, contineri quin complectar non queo; Eun. 859.

deterreo (2): Amph. 559, quin loquar numquam me potes deterrere.

prohibeo (3): Amph. 1051, neque prohibebunt quin sic faciam.

retineo, teneo (4): Trin. 641, retineri nequeo quin dicam; Cas. 239, vix teneor quin dicam; Curc. 228.

[1] Durham, p. 85 ff.

[2] See Kienitz, De *quin* particulae . . . usu, 1878; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 594.

comprimo : Most. 203, vix comprimor quin involem illi.

reprimo (2) : M. G. 1368, vix reprimor quin te manere iubeam.

moror (4) : Bacch. 340, numquam te morabitur quin habeas.

mora (3, all in Terence) : And. 971, nec mora est quin ducam.

remoror : M. G. 920, si non nos materiarius remoratur quod opus quin det (reading, with Durham, p. 87, *quin* for *qui* of the MSS.).

depello : Trin. 640, neque depellar quin rumori serviam.

numquid vis (3) : Amph. 970, numquid vis quin abeam?

alieno : Amph. 399, me alienabis numquam quin noster siem.

vinco : Stich. 756, numquam vinces quin pruriam.

non possum (9) : Trin. 705, non possum quin exclamem ; H. T. 761.

non potest fieri : Trin. 729, nullo modo potest fieri quin dos detur.

fallit : Hec. 728, nec me fallit quin sit.

abesse non potest (2, both from C. Gracchus) : Frag. (Meyer, p. 230), abesse non potest quin dicamini ; p. 229.

est in manu (= possum prohibere) : Trin. 105, quin dicant non est (in manu).

nequeo (4) : M. G. 1342, nequeo quin fleam.

recuso : Curc. 164, haud recusem quin mihi male sit.

intermitto : Cato, Agr. 38, 2, ne intermittas quin semper siet.

facio (3) : Amph. 398, numquam facies quin sim Sosia ; M. G. 283 ; 474.

audeo : Asin. 25, ut non audeam quin promam omnia.

negotium : Capt. 525, neque negotiumst quin male occidam oppetamque pestem ; cf. Morris, ad loc., "nor is there anything to hinder me from dying." This sense of *negotium* is common.

abstineo (2) : Bacch. 915, abstinere quin attingas non queas.

In the two following the notion is to prevent by reward or entreaty : Cas. 504, conduci non possum quin comparem magnum malum ; Amph. 159, nec quisquam (qui impediat) quin omnes deputent.

Peculiar are the following : Aul. 111, veri simile non est hominem pauperem pauxillum parvi facere quin nummum petat ; Vid. 88, quin accedat faenus id non postulo ; Trin. 587, ⟨nullo modo⟩ aequom videtur quin quod peccarim mihi obsit ; Amph. 1106, non metuo quin meae uxori latae suppetiae sient ; Enn. Trag. 245, certatio est nulla

quin monstrum siet; Phor. 971, neque sis veritus quin faceres; Hec. 398, scio nemini aliter suspectum (=dubitatum) fore quin putent.

The great bulk of the foregoing examples are perfectly clear and intelligible. In many of them we plainly see vestiges of an original parataxis. Others are manifestly extensions which have grown up under the influence of more primitive uses, after the construction had become generally prevalent. Some of the examples last cited are certainly far remote from their first source.

Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gram. § 510) does not regard the *quin*-clause with verbs of hindering as of deliberative origin, but apparently as a dependent purpose clause, like clauses introduced by *quominus;* but the fact that *quin*-clauses are dependent only on negative expressions or interrogative expressions implying a negative is not adequately accounted for on this hypothesis. It *is* accounted for on the theory of a deliberative origin.

B. With *cur (quor)*.

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause introduced by *cur* developed from the deliberative is seen in And. 103, quid obstat quor non fiant?

b) RANGE OF USE. But few instances of this usage are found in Early Latin. In addition to the Andria passage just cited I have noted only Stich. 52, nequest quor studeam has nuptias mutarier; Acc. 147, quid est cur ausis? Com. Incert. Ribb. p. 150, non est cur velis vivere; Poen. 533, non iusta causa quor curratur? Titin. 65, quid ego feci quem pauperetis? should, I believe, read *quor pauperetis.*

C. With *Quam ob Rem*.

a) ORIGIN. This is seen in Hec. 453, quam causam dicam quam ob rem non redducam? Further examples are: Hec. 695; And. 382; Naev. Com. 128; Most. 987, quid merear, quam ob rem mentiar? This last may have been paratactic, but Naev. Com. 39, ultro meretur quam ob rem ametur, is purely analogical. Other examples with *mereo, promereo,* are: Amph. 1142, haud promeruit quam ob rem vitio vorteres; Stich. 82, nil quam ob rem id faciam meruisse.

D. With *Qua Causa.*

Under this head belong Men. 490, quid merui qua me causa perderes? H. T. 989, inventast causa qua te expellerent. The second of these is an analogical extension.

E. With *Quapropter.*

Amph. 815, quid ego feci qua istaec propter dicantur mihi?

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE OPTATIVE.

1. With Verbs of Wishing, Desiring, Preferring, etc.[1]

a) ORIGIN. The origin of the substantive clause developed from the optative is clearly seen in expressions like Truc. 473, inveniat volo, originally paratactic, 'may he find; I desire it;' Cas. 559, veniat, velim, 'may he come; I should like (him to)'; Poen. 289, amet malim, 'may he love; I should prefer (that he should).'

b) FORM.

1) Without *ut* (45). This is very common in the early period, particularly in Plautus. With *vellem, malo, mavellem,* we find only the simple subjunctive, never an *ut*-clause. With *volo, velim, nolo,* both forms occur. Examples:

volo (9): Pers. 293, eveniant volo tibi quae optas; 832, obsit volo; Poen. 279, at ego elixus sis volo; Truc. 473, inveniat volo; Pseud. 1122; Rud. 1332; Trin. 372; Epid. 463; Naev. Com. 37, diu vivat volo.

velim (20): Present: Cas. 559, veniat velim; so also Aul. 670; Most. 1074; Poen. 1288; Pseud. 1061; Cas. 234, vera dicas velim; Rud. 511, velim vomas; 877, verum sit velim; Phor. 449, velim facias; Ad. 681, velim ames; Turp. 26, credas mihi velim.

Perfect: Bacch. 334, mihi dederit velim; Poen. 570, deciderint velim; Ad. 519, se defetigarit velim; Poen. 1206, velim de me dixerit; Rud. 662.

vellem (4): Poen. 1066, viverent vellem; Ad. 532, vellem mos esset; Stich. 312, vellem hae fores erum fugissent; Afran. 308, vellem intervenissem.

Other forms of volo (4): Amph. 9, voltis ea adferam; 56, utrum sit an non voltis; Cato, Agr. 43, 2, si voles crescant; so 46, 2.

1 Durham, p. 92 ff.

malo: Pseud. 209, at taceas malo; Afran. 264, di te mactas-
sint malo; H. T. 928.

malim (3): Poen. 289, amet malim; 1150, facias modo malim;
1184, malim istuc aliis videatur.

mavellem: only Bacch. 1047, mavellem foret.

Other forms of *malo :* Ad. 780, mavis cerebrum dispergam ?

nolo: Merc. 107, nolo resciscat; And. 819, nolo videat; so
also Eun. 906. These expressions are analogical, being modelled on
videat volo; cf. p. 216 f.

satius est: Cato, Agr. 54, 1, pascantur satius erit.

exopto: Pseud. 938, si exoptem quantum dignus es tantum
dent.

In several cases, verbs of the above classes are followed by *quam*
with the simple subjunctive: viz. Asin. 121, moriri mavolet quam
non perfectum reddat; Cas. 111, hercle me suspendio quam eius
potior fias satiust mortuom; Asin. 810, emori me malim quam non
indicem; Aul. 661, emortuom me mavelim quam non dem. The
negative in the first and last two examples shows that we probably
have to do with secondary extensions, since a *non indicem* or *non
dem* in an original use would be irregular. The natural negative
would be *ne.*

2) With *ut* (75).

volo (6): Bacch. 77, ut ille te videat volo; Pers. 696, ut
requiram volo; Rud. 768; Most. 1098; Eun. 192.

velim: Most. 632, velim ut uno nummo plus petas.

Other forms of *volo* (15): Asin. 720, opta id quod ut contingat
vis; Cist. 119, numquid me vis ? : : ut valeas; so Epid. 512; Men. 328;
Phor. 151; Pseud. 276, (voltis) ut male sit mihi; Amph. 8; Cato,
Agr. 99, si voles ut integrae sint; 64, 1; Stat. 162, ut devomas volt.

malim: Trin. 762, malim ut verum dicas; Poen. 1184, malim
videatur quam ut conlaudes; Truc. 742, mortuom me quam ut patiar
mavelim.

nolo: Lucil. 453, ut publicanus fiam, id nolo (apparently the only
instance of *nolo ut*, except Hyg. Fab. 189, 9; Firm. Mat., De Err. 8, 3).

opto (4): always with *ut* in Early Latin; H. T. 756, optabit
ut abeat; Ad. 874, ut vivat optant; M. G. 669; 1038.

quaeso (15): always with *ut* in early Latin; Amph. 720,

deos quaeso ut pariam; Cas. 390, deos quaeso ut sortitio eveniat; And. 487, deos quaeso ut sit superstes; Ad. 491, haec primum ut fiant deos quaeso; Naev. 95, quaeso ut adimant.

exopto: Men. 817, exopto ut fiam; Rud. 874; Hec. 490, exopto ut vitam exigat.

precor (9): Rud. 640, te digna ut eveniant precor; Enn. Ann. 30, precor ut visas; Cato, Agr. 134, 2, precor ut sies volens; 139; 141, 2, precor ut prohibessis; Pacuv. 297, precor uti verruncent; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201; Afran. 83, ut fortunassint precor.

comprecor: Ad. 699, comprecare deos ut accersas.

spero: Cist. 596, deos spero : : eosdem ego — uti abeas; Rud. 629, si speras ut sit.   By analogy also

spes: Bacch. 369, nemo nisi quem spes reliquere omnes esse ut frugi possiet.

veneror (7): Rud. 257, veneror ut eximat, ut adiuvet; 305; 1349; Poen. 278; 950.

oro (3): Trin. 57, oro ut suppetat; Asin. 783.

invoco: Most. 529, (invoco) ut det; Acc. Praet. 6, invoco ut verruncent.

expeto: Cas. 430, expetivisse ne ea mihi daretur atque ut illi nuberet.

praeopto: Trin. 648, praeoptavisti uti praeponeres.

adiuro: Bacch. 777, per omnis deos adiuro ut lacerentur?

obtestor: Asin. 18, ita ted obtestor ut tibi superstes uxor siet atque ut pestem oppetas.

dico ('pray'): Rud. 1345, dic ut exradicet.

satius est: Cist. 662, quam ut sinam satiust mihi interire.

magis in mentem est (= *malo*): Bacch. 130, magis in mentemst mihi ut haec concuret.

3) With *ne* (3): Rud. 1067, ne videas velim; M. G. 1086; Cas. 431.

4) With *ut ne:* M. G. 1050, quid vis ? : : ut ne spernas; Rud. 629.

Perfect with Aoristic Force, Referring to the Future, in Substantive Clauses Developed from the Optative.   This occurs: Bacch. 334, mihi dederit velim; Poen. 570, deciderint velim; 950, deos veneror ut siritis; Cas. 396, quaeso ut tua sors effugerit; Rud. 305, Venerem veneremur ut nos adiuverit; Cato, Agr. 141, 2, precor ut prohibessis,

uti siris; Afran. 83, uti fortunassint precor; 264, di te mactassint malo.

Besides this the perfect occurs as a true perfect in Poen. 950, deos veneror ut venerim; Ad. 519, se defetigarit velim; Poen. 1206, velim de me quid dixerit; Rud. 662, velim malas edentaverit.

2. With Verbs of Fearing.[1]

a) ORIGIN. Kühner (Ausf. Lat. Gramm. ii, p. 823) followed by Lattmann, (De Conjunctivo Latino, p. 89 f.) regards clauses introduced by *ut* and *ne* after verbs of fearing as indirect questions. According to this theory, *timeo ut veniat* meant originally, 'I fear how he will come;' and *timeo ne veniat* meant, 'I fear whether he will not come.' But this last involves the assumption of a meaning for *ne* not found in the literature.

It seems much more natural to explain *ut-* and *ne-* clauses with expressions of fearing as dependent optatives; i.e. to assume that *timeo ne veniat* meant originally, 'may he not come; I am afraid (he will);' and *timeo ut veniat*, 'may he only come; I am afraid (he won't).' Cf. the French, *je crains qu'il ne vienne*, originally, 'may he not come; I am afraid (he will).' For the use of *ut* with independent optatives, see p. 193; and for support of the theory of origin advocated for these clauses, cf. Bottek, Ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Konjunktivs in lat. Nebensätzen, p. 19; Cauer, Grammatica Militans, p. 119 ff.; Goodwin, Greek Moods and Tenses, 261; 262; 307.

Hale, in Hale-Buck. Lat. Gramm. 502, 4, regards the dependent clause with expressions of this sort as of volitive origin. But this view seems psychologically less natural than the one above advocated. A state of fear is quite compatible with a wish, but hardly with a peremptory order.

b) FORM.

1) With *ne* (136).

metuo (77).

Present tense: Pseud. 1028, metuo ne erus redeat; Poen. 883, ego hoc metuo ne me perduim; Men. 989, metuo ne sero veniam; Trin. 1042, metuo ne aliam rem occipiat loqui; H. T. 808, nec quicquam magis metuo quam ne extrudar; Eun. 140, metuat ne relinquam; 450; 611, metuo fratrem ne intus sit; 855, hanc metui ne me criminaretur;

[1] Durham, p. 98 ff.

Phor. 491; Hec. 337; Bacch. 1173, non metuo nequid mihi doleat; Aul. 609, non metuo ne quisquam inveniat; Cist. 495; Aul. 61, metuo ne mi verba duit neu persentiscat; M. G. 996, metuo ne obsint neve opstent.

Perfect as aorist: Bacch. 38, metuo lusciniolae ne defuerit cantio; Men. 861, metuo ne quid male faxit; Pers. 478, nec metuo nequis mihi in iure abiurassit; M. G. 526, metuo nequid infuscaverit.

Present perfect: Most. 550, metuo ne techinae meae perpetuo perierint; 542, metuo ne indaudiverit; M. G. 428; Asin. 286; Cas. 304; 575; Titin. 107, metuo ne fecerim.

Imperfect and pluperfect: Cas. 908; Poen. 1378; Pseud. 912; metuebam ne abisses; M. G. 722, metuerem ne diffregisset crura.

timeo (10): M. G. 1348, metuo et timeo ne hoc tandem propalam fiat; Truc. 774, timeo ne malefacta sint inventa omnia; And. 269, hoc timet ne deseras se; H. T. 434, timet ne adaucta sit; 664, timui ne esses; Eun. 160; Lucil. 593, timeo ne accuser; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, timerem nequid mali fortuna moliretur.

timidus sum: Hec. 734, timida sum ne obsiet.

formido (7): Cist. 673, quae in tergum ne veniant male formido; Poen. 378; Most. 511, formido ne me opprimat; Catulus (Baehrens), p. 276, ne teneamur formido.

adformido: Bacch. 1078, adformido ne pereat neu corrumpatur.

paveo: M. G. 904, nequid peccetis paveo; Pers. 626.

vereor (21): Present tense: Capt. 308, non verear ne imperet; M. G. 943, haud verear ne pervincamur; And. 73, vereor ne adportet; Phor. 585; Hec. 412, vereor ne intellegat; Ad. 684.

Perfect as aorist: H. T. 198, nil magis vereor quam ne quid faxit.

Present perfect: Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; Rud. 390, eam veretur ne perierit; Eun. 81, vereor ne tulerit neve acceperit; H. T. 231, vereor ne corrupta sit.

Imperfect and pluperfect: And. 582, veritus sum ne faceres; Turp. 112, veritus sum ne limasses.

sollicitor: Ad. 36, sollicitor ne aut alserit aut ceciderit.

Also with nouns denoting fear, danger, etc.: *periculum* (5): Capt. 91, quod mihi ne eveniat periculumst; M. G. 1151; Asin. 388; only in Plautus. *metus:* M. G. 1233, metus me macerat ne sententiam mutent. *cura:* Truc. 455, quantast cura dolus ne occidat!

Even where no word suggesting fear is expressed, we often find a *ne*-clause dependent upon the general idea of fearing involved in the context. Instances of this use are rare outside of Plautus. Examples: M. G. 597, sinite me prius perspectare, ne insidiae sient; Truc. 736, discant, dum mihi adcentare liceat, ni oblitus siem (with *ni* for *ne*); Aul. 39, aurum inspicere volt ne subreptum siet, 'for fear that it has been stolen;' 82, ego intus servem? an ne quis aedis auferat? 647, ne inter tunicas habeas; Capt. 127, ad captivos meos visam, ne quippiam turbaverint; Curc. 558, venit in mentem mihi, ne tarpezita exsulatum abierit, argentum ut petam; Men. 161, ne te uxor sequatur respectas identidem; Pers. 77, visam hesternas reliquias, ne quis obreptaverit; Pseud. 654, huc quidem hercle haud ibis intro, ni quid 'harpax' feceris. Note here *ni* for *ne*, and the perfect with aoristic force. Rud. 896, uxor me servat ne quid significem; 1168, non circumspexi ne quis inspectaret; Trin. 146, circumspicedum ne quis adsit arbiter; Phor. 508, (id dicis) ne parum leno sies.

That these clauses do not denote purpose, is clear from the most superficial examination. In origin they were probably paratactic optatives. Yet that they contributed to the development of the purpose clause, is probable; see below, p. 255.

    2) With *ut* (16).

        metuo (10): Bacch. 762, metuo ut possiem emolirier; Curc. 464, ornamenta metuo ut possim recipere; Most. 465; M. G. 355; Pers. 319; And. 914, metuo ut substet; Hec. 257; Ad. 627; Lucil. 529, metuo ut possit; 898.

        paveo: And. 349, id paves ne ducas; tu autem ut ducas.

        vereor: And. 705, ut satis sit vereor; 277; Phor. 965, vereor ut placari possit; Hec. 101, firmae vereor ut sint nuptiae; Pacuv. 154, ut queam vereor.

    3) With *ne non* (4): Cas. 575, metuo ne non sit surda; Pers. 686, ne non sat esses leno, id metuebas; H. T. 1017, metuis ne non convincas; Ad. 217, metuisti ne non faeneraret.

    4) With *quo minus*: Hec. 630, ne revereatur minus quo redeat (to avoid ambiguity, owing to the preceding *ne*).

    5) With *ni*: Men. 420, hunc metuebam ni meae uxori renuntiaret.

  Connecting Negatives after Expressions of Fearing. The regular connective is *neve* (*neu*) (4): Aul. 61, metuo ne verba duit neu per-

sentiscat; Bacch. 1078, adformido ne pereat neu corrumpatur; M. G. 996, metuo ne obsint neve obstent; Eun. 81, vereor ne tulerit neve acceperit. In Ad. 36, *aut* occurs as connective, sollicitor ne alserit aut ceciderit.

Perfect with Aoristic Force, Referring to the Future. This occurs after expressions of fearing in the following instances: Bacch. 38, metuo lusciniolae ne defuerit cantio; Men. 861, metuo ne quid faxit; M. G. 526, metuo ne quid infuscaverit; Pers. 478, nec metuo nequis mihi in iure abiurassint; Pseud. 654, ni quid 'harpax' feceris; Truc. 736, ni oblitus siem; H. T. 198, nil magis vereor quam ne quid faxit.

The Perfect also occurs with frequency used as a true present perfect, e.g. Most. 550, metuo ne techinae perierint; M. G. 428, metuo ne nosmet perdiderimus; Merc. 380; Rud. 390; Truc. 774; H. T. 231, vereor ne corrupta sit; 434.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF PURPOSE.

The clause of purpose is probably partly volitive, partly optative in origin. Thus an original *tibi pecuniam do; ut*[1] *panem emas,* 'I give you money; just buy bread!' could naturally, as a result of the context, develop into the meaning, 'I give you money, that you may buy bread.'[2] So an original *eum custodite; ne pedem ecferat !* would naturally come to mean, 'watch him, lest he stir a foot!' In many passages in Early Latin it is difficult to determine whether a *ne*-clause is a dependent clause of purpose or an independent prohibitive. The share of the optative in the development of the purpose clause is also probably quite as great as that of the volitive. Expressions like M. G. 597, sinite me prius perspectare, ne uspiam insidiae sient; 1137, circumspicite, ne quis adsit arbiter, show how easily an optative expression develops into one of purpose; and the meaning in practically all purpose clauses is entirely consistent with an optative origin. The *ne*-clause in the two passages just cited I interpret as dependent upon an implied notion of fear, 'look around, for fear lest.' Yet others doubtless may see in these and in the similar expressions collected at p. 254 fully developed purpose clauses.

---

[1] *Ut* is here the indefinite adverb, 'somehow,' 'just,' 'only'; see p. 164 f.

[2] Cf. the occasional use of the imperative in parataxis with identical force, e.g. Amph. 353, nunc abi sane! advenisse familiares dicito! = abi ut dicas!

In a very few instances we find purpose clauses without any introductory particle, e.g. Stich. 757, date bibat, originally 'give him! let him drink!' hence 'give him to drink!' Cato, Agr. 73, dato bubus bibant omnibus; 156, 6, dato vini bibat quam minimum; 157, 9, dato edit; dato panem purum madefaciat; dato bibat. All of these point to an original parataxis. The two following examples are 'extensions' based on the original type: Curc. 313, da obsorbeam; Truc. 367, cedo bibam.[1]

The preservation of these interesting relics is doubtless due to the frequency of their employment in the daily routine of the family life. To the same cause is to be attributed the equally primitive and equally interesting *da bibere.*

Relative clauses of purpose may be conceived to have originated in sentences like *tibi hunc librum do quem legas,* 'I give you this book; read which! (read it!); i.e. 'I give you this book to read.'

It is obvious that as a rule only those purpose clauses are of primitive origin in which the main clause and subordinate clause refer to different persons. Thus in a sentence like *pecuniam mutuatur ut panem emat, ut emat* cannot be explained as an original paratactic jussive. Such a use as that in the sentence just cited can be explained only as an extension of the original paratactic use (cf. p. 210 f.). Whenever a new syntactical category develops, it almost inevitably extends far beyond the boundaries of the territory in which it first came into being.

Classification of Purpose Clauses.

1. Purpose clauses introduced by *ut* (542), e.g. Amph. 195, me praemisit ut haec nuntiem; and frequently in all authors of the early period.

The main clause occasionally contains *ita* anticipating the *ut* clause, e.g. Pseud. 579, ita ('with this in view') paravi copias, ut facile vincam; so Cato, Agr. 8, 2, ita paret itaque conserat, uti quam sollertissimum habeat; cap. 133.

Ut may even occur with comparatives. While *quo* is commoner

---

[1] Cf. Apuleius, Met. ii, 16, porrigit bibam, the only instance of this idiom that I have noted outside of Plautus and Cato. In Most. 373, we find *cedo ut bibam,* where, however, Bentley, followed by Leo and Lindsay, deletes *ut.*

in purpose clauses containing a comparative (see p. 261), yet *ut* occurs 14 times in such clauses, viz. Amph. 110, ut rem teneatis rectius; 142, internosse ut nos possitis facilius; Aul. 596; Capt. 33; 290; Cist. 636; Pers. 181; Acc. 281; 598; Cato, Agr. 103; 124; cap. 133; H. T. 681, ut frugalior sim; Phor. 533, ut potior sit.

There are 2 instances of *ut non*, viz. Stich. 588, quid opust? : : hunc ut vocem, te non vocem; And. 394, ut non queat. In both of these the negative is 'adhaerescent,' i.e. is closely associated with a single word, instead of modifying the clause as a whole.

As a rule the *ut*-clause connects itself with the verb of the main clause and expresses the motive of an actor; but in one instance it connects itself with a single word and denotes the adaptation of means to end, viz. Pacuv. 304, satis habeam virium ut te ara arceam.

2. Purpose clauses introduced by *ne* (254), e.g. Amph. 527, ne legio persentiscat, clam redeundum est mihi, ne me uxorem praevortisse dicant prae re publica; Aul. 1, ne quis miretur, eloquar; 113, celo sedulo ne sciant; Capt. 291, Samiis vasis utitur ne Genius surripiat; 456, servate ne pedem ecferat. In all of these, the theory of an optative origin (see above, p. 255) seems at least as simple and natural as that of a volitive origin. In the other examples of the construction, the theory of a volitive origin, though often possible, is never necessary.

Occasionally the main clause contains *ita* anticipating the *ne*-clause, e.g. Capt. 737, hunc me velle dicite, ita curarier ne qui deterius huic sit; so also Most. 920; Trin. 343; Cato, Agr. 3, 1.

In a few instances we find the perfect used with the force of the present, viz. Asin. 373, tu cavebis ne me attingas, ne malo cum auspicio nomen commutaveris; Cas. 627, abscede ab ista ne quid mali faxit; M. G. 333, hic obsistam ne se subrepsit; Truc. 523, magis tritici opust granariis ne nos extinxit fames. In Ad. 281, istum absolvitote ne hoc permanet atque ego perierim, *perierim* (like *oderim* and *noverim*) is probably to be regarded as denoting the state resulting from a completed act.

To be distinguished from these aorist perfects, are the following true present perfects: Asin. 698, ne nequiquam dixeris, vehas; the same expression also Bacch. 701; Most. 252; Cas. 569, ne me nequiquam advocaverit.

As in the later Latinity, so also in Early Latin, the instances are
frequent in which the *ut-* or *ne-*clause gives the purpose, not of the
fact stated, but of the speaker in making the statement, e.g. Epid.
702, quis est? : : amica, ut scias; 648; Curc. 715, ut scire possis
libera haec est; Asin. 843, ut verum dicam, ea res me male habet;
235, ut scire possis; Poen. 1038; Most. 839, ut te absolvam, nullam
conspicio; H. T. 457, ut alia omittam, absumpsit; Eun. 926; Phor.
654, ut aperte fabuler; Hec. 135, ut ad pauca redeam, uxorem de-
ducit.   With *ne:* Cas. 38, morbo cubat, nequid mentiar; Cist. 558,
nutrix est, ne matrem censeas; Curc. 724, te perire cupio, ne nescias;
Men. 23; 47, ne erretis, praedico; Most. 1005.

3. **Purpose clauses introduced by *ut ne* (24)**: Amph. 489, uno labore
absolvat ut ne in suspicione ponatur; Aul. 648, vah scelestus, quam
benigne, ut ne intellegam; Merc. 960, expurigationem habebo ut ne
suscenseat; And. 259, aliquid facerem ut ne hoc facerem; Enn. Trag.
351, quos ego dimitto ut ne res temere tractent; Cato, Agr. 33, 1,
vitem deligato recte flexuosa uti ne sit; Amph. 126; Capt. 267;
Cas. 513; Cist. 41; Merc. 992; M. G. 164; Pers. 603; Truc. 62;
H. T. 269; Eun. 439; 945; Phor. 168; 245; 314; Ad. 354.   In the
following we have the perfect tense, used as a true present perfect:
M. G. 199, quid agam, id ut ne visum siet? 227, cedo consilium ut
visa ne sint; Eun. 942 ulciscar ut ne inpune in nos inluseris.

4. **Relative clauses of purpose (435)**.
These are classified according to the particles by which they are
introduced:

a) Introduced by relative pronouns (the commonest form), e.g.
Amph. 183, aliquem hominem allegent qui mihi os occillet; 377,
ut esset quem tu caederes; Asin. 188, si habeas quod des; Eun.
1078, habet quod det; Hec. 298, nova res ortast quae me abstrahat;
Enn. Trag. 169, date ferrum qui me anima privem; Pacuv. 61, habeo
ego qui distinguam; Rud. 767, ignem faciam : : quin inhumanum
exuras tibi ?

b) Introduced by *ubi* (42), Capt. 12, si non ubi sedeas locus est;
837, nescioquem nactus es ubi cenes; Curc. 311, datin sellam ubi
assidat? 387, reliqui locum ubi reconderem; Phor. 596, tempus
sibi dari ubi ostenderet; Cato, Agr. 11, 1, dolia ubi vinaceos condat;
14, 2; 129, aream ubi frumentum teratur.

c) Introduced by *unde* (29), M. G. 687, eme lanam unde pallium conficiatur; Pers. 493, quaedam res unde lucrum facias; Poen. 185, neque id unde efficiat habet; Trin. 158, habeo dotem unde dem; Ad. 122, est unde haec fiant.

d) Introduced by *quo* (21), Capt. 103, nil est quo me recipiam; Men. 669, quasi non habeam quo intromittar alium locum; And. 606, utinam mi esset aliquid quo me darem; Cato, Agr. 66, 1, cortinam quo olea fluat.

e) Introduced by *qua* (6), M. G. 142, perfodi parietem qua commeatus esset; Cato, Agr. 112, 1, relinquito locum qua interspiret; so 112, 3; 113, 1.

Besides the formal classification, we may also divide relative purpose clauses into:

a) Those in which the clause as a whole is adverbial.

b) Those in which the clause is adjectival.

Examples of **a)** are Amph. 950, gubernatorem arcessat qui nobiscum prandeat; Bacch. 1181, i intro ubi tibi sit lepide; M. G. 142, cited above.

Examples of **b)** are given in abundance above.

Adverbial relative purpose clauses are relatively rare, though chronologically they probably antedate adjectival purpose clauses. An example illustrating the ease of transition from the adverbial to the adjective value is M. G. 687, eme lanam unde pallium conficiatur, which may be taken either as 'buy wool in order that a cloak may be made,' or 'wool to make a cloak from.' These adjective purpose clauses are all descriptive. See below, p. 287.

Other views have been proposed in explanation of some, at least, of the above examples. Thus in sentences like Poen. 537, est domi quod edimus; Capt. 12, est ubi ambules; 121, non est quod dem; 12, non ubi sedeas locus est; Poen. 833, habet quod det; Most. 344, da illi quod bibat, Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gramm. 517, 2; cf. also Frank, Classical Philology, ii, p. 168) takes the dependent clause as potential. But Frank, ibid. 163 ff., well shows the baselessness of this view. He himself follows the traditional interpretation, which regards these clauses as relative clauses of purpose, though admitting that secondarily they have acquired a 'can' potential connotation. I do not find myself able to go even that far. To my mind,

*homines misit qui nuntiarent; mihi aquam dedit quam biberem; mihi
da quod bibam; non est quod dem; quod edit non habet; locus est ubi
ambules,* etc., are all varied types of one and the same kind of sub-
ordinate clause, viz. the relative clause of purpose. To read the
'can' notion into any of the expressions of this type occurring in
Early Latin is in my judgment a gratuitous alteration of their
obvious meaning. Certainly until it is shown that *det* and *haec fiant*
can mean respectively, 'he can give,' and 'these things can be done,'
I see no justification in claiming a 'can' potential origin and value
for the dependent clause in *ut habeat quod det* and *est unde fiant,* etc.

Equally gratuitous to me seems the theory of Elmer, who explains
these clauses as volitive descriptive clauses (see p. 294). See his
note on Capt. 12, si non ubi sedeas locus est.

5. Relative purpose clauses with *dignus, indignus, idoneus, etc.* (25):
Asin. 80, me dignum habuit quoi concrederet; 149; 314, dignissumi
quo cruciatus confluant; Cist. 248; M. G. 1043, deus dignior fuit
quisquam qui esset? Pseud. 611; Rud. 406; 522; And. 230; H. T.
741; Eun. 312, est digna res ubi nervos intendas; 1052; Hec. 212;
Pacuv. 25; Gracch. (Meyer), p. 231; Stich. 205, haud indignos iudico
qui miseri sint; Eun. 866; Hec. 477; Bacch. 616a, indignior quoi di
bene faciant; Aul. 252, hominem idoneum quem ludos facias; And.
493; 758; Afran. 198. Here belongs also Poen. 1335, bellum homi-
nem quem noveris; so 1384.

With Madvig and Roby I regard relative clauses like those just
cited as a special development of purpose clauses. To my mind
there is no logical difference between *nemo est quem imiter,* 'there is
no one for me to imitate,' and *nemo est dignus quem imiter.* The
frequency of expressions (see 4, *a* above) like Curc. 386, reliqui locum
ubi reconderem, where the relative clause of purpose has come to
designate the end or adaptation of something, was calculated to bring
about the use of relative clauses of purpose with adjectives of fitness,
suitability, and adaptation. Cf. also the use of the gerund with *ad*
after *dignus,* e.g. Cic. Rep. i, 18, 30, dignus ad imitandum. We also
find the infinitive with *dignus* and *idoneus.*

Some (e.g. Greenough, Gramm. 535 f.) have regarded the relative
clause with these adjectives as a clause of characteristic (descriptive
clause of fact; see p. 289), i.e. as the kind of clause seen in *nemo est*

qui audeat: but the logical difference between clauses of this last kind and those under discussion must at once be obvious. Professor Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gramm. § 513, 3) designates the clauses under discussion as 'relative clauses of obligation or propriety' and considers them a manifestation of a somewhat extensive class of related uses, which he designates as the subjunctive of obligation and propriety. But the recognition of any such category of general independent fundamental uses lacks justification. Within certain narrow limits we do find subjunctives of obligation and propriety. Thus one development of the deliberative has this force (see p. 179 ff.) in interrogative sentences; and in non-interrogative sentences we find the imperfect and pluperfect so used, as the secondary development of the jussive and prohibitive (p. 176 f.). But outside of these limits I cannot see grounds for recognizing a subjunctive of obligation and propriety; and neither of these last two uses can have furnished a starting-point for the *dignus qui*-clauses.

6. Purpose clauses introduced by *quo = ut* (23). *Quo* in these is simply the relative pronoun used as an ablative of degree of difference. It is regularly, though not invariably, used with comparatives (see p. 257). Examples: Aul. 33, quo facilius ducat; Men. 9, quo graecum videatur magis; Poen. 39; 669; 905; 1109; H. T. 542; 914, quo facilius dentur; Eun. 150; Lucil. 894; Cato, Agr. 5, 6.

Quo minus and *quo setius* denote negative purpose, viz. And. 197, si sensero hodie quicquam in his te nuptiis fallaciae conari quo fiant minus; Afran. 292, turbat me quo (tuā equo, *codd.*) setius me colligam.

In the following 5 instances *quo* occurs even without a comparative: Amph. 834, quo me impudicum faceret; Rud. 1329, quo nil invitus addas, talentum magnum (postulo); And. 472; H. T. 127; XII Tables in Cic. de Leg. ii, 23, homini mortuo ne ossa legito quo post funus faciat.

7. Purpose clauses introduced by *qui = ut* (7): Cist. 714, qui facilius posset noscere; Poen. 1264, magis qui credatis; Hec. 869, qui facilius credas; Aul. 596, qui laborent minus. In all these *qui* is combined with a comparative. In the following examples the comparative is lacking: Amph. 339, hominem contra conloqui qui possim videri fortis; Cato, Agr. 39, 2, qui colorem eundem facias; And. 5,

in prologis scribundis operam abutitur, non qui argumentum narret sed qui respondeat.

8. Substantive clauses of purpose (57). These are employed:

I. As appositives of various substantive ideas. Thus with

a) *Causa* (9): Eun. 512, causam ut manerem repperit; 138, fingit causas ne det; Acc. 292, eaque ivi causa ut ne quis nostra verba cleperet; Men. 892; Cato, Agr. 21, 4; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232; Hec. 105; Stich. 312; Aul. 464.

b) *Gratia* (5): And. 588, ea gratia ut pertemptarem; Trag. Incer. Ribb. p. 301; H. T. 769, ea gratia ne tu persentisceres; Aul. 32; Merc. 223.

c) *Hanc ob rem; ob eam rem;* etc. (8): Trin. 652, ob eam rem, ut tibi sit; Pseud. 795; Cas. 1005 (propter eam rem); Epid. 276 (quam ad rem); Truc. 395 (quoi rei); M. G. 1420; Rud. 717; Hec. 6.

d) *Eo,* M. G. 1080, eo minus dixi, ne censeret.

e) *Id, illud, hoc* (5): Amph. 909, id huc revorti ut me purgarem; Cas. 680; 532; Stich. 589; And. 162.

f) *Idcirco, propterea* (4): Pseud. 564, idcirco quo vos oblectem; Bacch. 730; 812; Hec. 106.

Hoc modo: Cato, Agr. 32, 1, arbores hoc modo putentur, rami uti divaricentur, et ne relinquantur.

II. As object of verbs. Thus:

a) With *paro, apparo, adorno* (14): Aul. 827, ut eriperes apparabas; Pseud. 486, paritas ut auferas; Trin. 1188; Phor. 957; Eun. 240; H. T. 948; Trag. incert. Ribb. i, p. 301; 304; Enn. Trag. 321, paratum pestem ut participet parem (*paratum* is Bentley's necessary conjecture for *paratam* of the MSS); Hec. 68; Epid. 361, adornat ut maritus fias; Rud. 129; Eun. 582.

b) With *exspecto, maneo* (3): Stich. 58, manet ut moneatur; Hec. 280, exspecto ut redeat; Trin. 734. Durham, p. 107, takes these as substantive clauses developed from the optative, but it seems more natural to explain them as purpose clauses.

III. Introduced by *quo minus* after expressions of hindering (6): CIL, i, 199, 34, neive prohibeto quo minus sumant; 33, quo minus pascere liceat ni quis prohibeto; 26, quod mora non fiat quo setius eam pequniam acipiant; Cato, Agr. 148, 1; Amph. 84, quive alter quo placeret fecisset minus; CIL, i, 198, 71, neive facito quo quis

eorum minus ad id iudicium adesse possit; And. 699, per me stetisse quo minus fierent nuptiae. In these last three the notion of hindering is suggested by the context.

That these *quo minus*-clauses are substantive clauses of purpose seems sufficiently indicated by the fact that elsewhere *quo*, when joined with a comparative and followed by the subjunctive, is a purpose particle. See above, p. 261. We even find *quo minus* introducing an adverbial purpose clause in And. 197, conari quo fiant minus.

9. Connecting negatives in purpose clauses (22).

a) Form *ne . . . neve (neu)*: Capt. 219, ne queant neu permanet; Epid. 165; Merc. 230; M. G. 6; Poen. 30; 605; Rud. 700; Eun. 278; Hec. 587; Pacuv. 228; Cato, Agr. 92; Truc. 59; 97.

b) Form *ut . . . neve (neu)*: Bacch. 648; Trin. 1143, ut filius crederet neu posset; Hec. 545.

c) Form *ut . . . et ne*, Cato, Agr. 32, 2, ut caedantur et ne relinquantur; 107, ut odorata sint et ne quid accedat.

d) Form *ut . . . atque ut ne*, Amph. 126, ut possem atque ut ne quaererent.

e) Miscellaneous (4), Eun. 965, ne neque prosis et pereas; Ad. 624, ne dicerem ac fieret palam; Eun. 93, ut aut doleret aut istuc nil penderem; Capt. 434, ne me ignores tuque te pro libero esse ducas, neque des operam.

In no instance is *neque* used as a connecting negative. In Eun. 965 and Capt. 437, *neque* goes closely with the verb, which in each case is governed by a preceding *ne*.

THE STIPULATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

"Stipulative Subjunctive" is the name I have given to an idiom discussed at length in Transactions of the American Philological Association, xxxi, p. 223 ff. The Stipulative I defined as "a subordinate subjunctive clause designating primarily some agreement, compact, or understanding under which the main act takes place." The idiom, as I undertook to show, is sharply differentiated both logically and formally from clauses of proviso and also from conditional clauses, with both of which at times it seems to have relationship.

The origin of the stipulative, I found in paratactic uses of the jussive and prohibitive. Thus in Curc. 660, tu ut hodie cenam des sororiam, hic nuptialem cras dabit, the idea is 'do you give a dinner to-day; (then) he will give one to-morrow; i.e. 'he will give one to-morrow, on the understanding or condition, that you give one to-day.' So in Trin. 518, arcano tibi ego hoc dico, ne ille ex te sciat, the original notion was 'I tell you this in confidence; let him not learn it from you!' i.e. 'on the understanding that he is not to learn it from you.'

While more commonly the stipulative clause has the simple force of 'on the understanding that, that not'; 'with the agreement that, that not,' yet, as a perfectly natural outgrowth of this original value, we find it developing, under the influence of the context, a variety of other values. Thus it may mean 'under the restriction that, that not'; 'with the reservation that, that not'; 'on pain of'; 'on condition that, that not.' In the affirmative form it may also have the force of 'by' with a verbal noun; while with negatives (regularly *ne* or *ut ne*) it frequently has the force of 'without' followed by a verbal noun ('without doing,' 'without saying,' etc.).

The material is distributed according to the foregoing logical categories, so far as they appear in Early Latin.

1. Stipulative clauses with the force of ' on the understanding that, that not'; ' under the agreement that, that not.'

a) Affirmative (20), Asin. 752; 915, poste demum huc cras adducam ad lenam, ut xx minas ei det, in partem hac amanti ut liceat ei potirier; Bacch. 875; 1184, quid tandem si dimidium auri redditur, in' mecum intro? atque ut eis delicta ignoscas; Capt. 948; Epid. 470, atque ita profecto, ut eam ex hoc exoneres agro; Men. 53; M. G. 979, vin tu illam actutum amovere, a te ut abeat per gratiam; 1148; Pers. 523, eam te volo curare ut istic veneat, ac suo periculo is emat qui mercabitur; 662; Pseud. 57; Rud. 929; 1409; Stich. 195, auctionem praedicem, ipse ut venditem; And. 148, ita discedo ut qui neget; Phor. 633, quid vis dari ut desistat, haec facessat? Cato, Agr. 15, uti dominus omnia ad opus praebeat . . . et uti sublinat locari oportet; C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 233, ego ut tacerem, decem talenta a rege accepi!

b) Negative (16).

1) With *ne, ut ne* (10): Asin. 229, quid me aequom censes dare, annum hunc ne cum quiquam alio sit; 635; Bacch. 224, veniat quando volt, atque ita ne mihi sit mora; 873, vis tibi ducentos nummos iam promittier, ut ne clamorem hic facias neu convicium; Poen. 888, nisi ero meo uni indicasso, atque ei quoque ut ne enuntiet; Trin. 141, quod meae concreditumst taciturnitati, ne enuntiarem neu facerem palam; 518; H. T. 783, ita istaec misceto ne me admisceas; Phor. 633, quid vis dari, tu molestus ne sies?

2) With *ni* (= *ne*) (5); see Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc., xxxi, p. 239 ff. Epid. 699, da pignus ni ea sit filia. The MSS read *sit*, and so Goetz in his first edition, Leo, and Lindsay. Poen. 1242, da pignus ni nunc perieres; Rud. 1380, cedo quicum habeam iudicem, ni dolo malo instipulatus sis nive etiamdum siem xxv annos natus; Truc. 275, pignus da, ni ligneae hae sint (sunt *P*) quas habes Victorias; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 62, 6, nunc si sponsionem fecissent cum Turio ni vir melior esset. On Pseud. 1070, roga me xx minas, si illa sit potitus, where I have suggested *ni* for *si*, see op. cit. p. 243 f.

3) With *nec*, Asin. 752, lenae dedit xx minas, ut secum esset . . . nec cum quiquam alio. The commoner connective with all clauses of volitive origin is *neve (neu)*, *nive*, and these occur in Bacch. 873; Trin. 141; Rud. 1380 (see above). But exceptions to this principle have already been noted, not only in independent but also in dependent sentences of volitive origin; see p. 170; 243.

2. Stipulative clauses with the force of ' on pain of,' ' under penalty of ' (4): Men. 216, ego hercle vero te et servabo et te sequar, neque hodie, ut te perdam meream deorum divitias mihi; originally ' on the understanding that I'm to lose you'; i.e. ' on pain of losing'; Stich. 24, neque ille sibi mereat Persarum montis, qui esse aurei perhibentur, ut istuc faciat; Bacch. 1183a, quem quidem ut non excruciem, alterum tantum auri non meream; Pers. 786, quem pol ego ut non in cruciatum atque in compedis cogam. . . . In these last two, we have irregularly *non* for *ne* or *ut ne* (cf. *nec* for *neu* in Asin. 752). In the last example the apodosis is omitted.

3. Stipulative clauses with the force of ' on condition that ' (5): Aul. 458, lege agito mecum, molestus ne sis, ' go to law (' on the understanding that,' and so) on condition that you only let me alone';

Curc. 660, tu ut hodie cenam des sororiam, hic nuptialem cras dabit: promittimus; Asin. 455, sic potius, ut Demaeneto tibi ero praesente reddam; Poen. 1364, cras auctionem faciam. : : tantisper quidem ut sis apud me lignea in custodia; Rud. 1127, concredam tibi, ac si istorum nil sit, ut mihi reddas.

4. Stipulative clauses with the force of 'by' with a verbal noun (8): Capt. 423, nunc adest occasio benefacta cumulare, ut erga hunc rem geras fideliter; M. G. 186, quem ad modum? : : ut eum qui se hic vidit verbis vincat ne viderit; Pers. 35; Stich. 121, qui potest mulier vitare vitiis? : : ut pridie caveat ne faciat quod pigeat; originally 'on the understanding that she avoid,' and so 'by avoiding.' Truc. 919; Bacch. 477; Pseud. 236, quonam pacto possim vincere animum? : : in rem quod sit praevortaris. In this last the usual *ut* is absent. Hence it is not impossible that we have an independent use of the jussive.

5. Negative stipulative clauses with the force of 'without' with a verbal noun (18): Amph. 388, obsecro ut per pacem te alloqui, ut ne vapulem, 'on the understanding that I'm not to be beaten,' and so, 'without being beaten'; Asin. 319, habeo familiarem tergum, ne quaeram foris; so Aul. 358; M. G. 638; Asin. 718, licet laudem Fortunam ut ne Salutem culpem; Bacch. 343; Capt. 331, eum si reddis mihi, praeterea unum nummum ne duis ('without paying me a didrachm besides); cf. Vid. 83, argenti minam adferam ad te, faenus mihi nullum duis; Merc. 145, dic mihi an boni quid usquamst, quod quisquam uti possiet, sine malo omni aut ne laborem capias; M. G. 1207, nam si possem ullo modo impetrare ut abiret ne te abduceret. *Ne* is the reading of the MSS, retained by Leo and Lindsay; *nec*, conjectured by Salmasius, is read by Götz-Schöll and others. Poen. 177; 662, hic clam furtim esse volt, nequis sciat neue arbiter sit; Pseud. 322; Trin. 663; Eun. 217, censen posse me offirmare perpeti ne redeam.

The following examples have *ni* for *ne :* Cist. 204, hanc ego de me coniecturam facio, ni foris quaeram; Merc. 693, parumne est malai rei quod amat Demipho, ni sumptuosus siet; Most. 414, ut proveniant sine malo, ni quid potiatur quam ob rem pigeat vivere. Here, as in Merc. 145, it is noteworthy that we have a stipulative coördinate with a *sine*-phrase.

6. Substantive stipulative clauses (28).[1] Nearly all of the classes of stipulative clauses above recognized pass readily into substantive clauses. Such substantive clauses occur with considerable frequency in connection with verbs of bargaining, contracting, and the like; also in apposition with nouns like *condicio, leges, foedus,* etc.[2]

Examples:

a) After verbs:

convenit: Capt. 378, nunc ita convenit inter me atque hunc, Tyndare, ut te in Alidem mittam; si non rebitas, huic ut xx minas dem; 397; Amph. 226; Aul. 258; Naev. Bell. Pun. 47, convenit regnum ut haberent, Truc. Arg. 10.

coniuro: Merc. 536, inter nos coniuravimus, neuter stupri caussa caput limaret.

conduco: Epid. 314, conducere aliquam fidicinam cantaret sibi. The text is uncertain; Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc. xxxi, p. 235. Epid. 500, conducta veni ut cantarem; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 58, 6, conduci uti taceat.

depeciscor: Phor. 165, ut mi liceat frui, depecisci morte cupio.

pacisco: Naev. Bell. Pun. 48, id quoque paciscunt, moenia sint ⟨tuta ?⟩; paciscit obsides ut reddat.

b) After nouns:

condicio: Bacch. 1041, duae condiciones sunt, vel ut aurum perdas vel ut amator perierit; Rud. 1030.

lex: Asin. 234, in leges meas dabo . . . perpetuom annum hunc mihi uti serviat nec quemquam alium admittat; Most. 360; Pers. 69; Asin. 735; Aul. 155; And. 200; Phor. 533.

rabo: Truc. 688, rabonem habeto ut mecum hanc noctem sies.

signum: Bacch. 329, id signumst cum Theotimo, ei aurum ut reddat.

pacto, modo ('terms'): Bacch. 1178, scin quo pacto me abducas ? :: mecum ut sis; Poen. 853, quo modo ? :: ut corium sufferas; Amph. 1023; Truc. 918.

The following also seem to belong here: Aul. 434, haud paenitet tua ne expetam; Curc. 663, quid dotis ? :: egone ? :: ut semper me alat; Men. 966, spectamen bono servo id est, ut rem eri tutetur.

---

[1] See Durham, Substantive Clauses, p. 64 ff.

[2] These substantive stipulative clauses are of course very closely related to the substantive clauses considered above on p. 236 f.

CLAUSES OF PROVISO.[1]

Clauses of Proviso seem to be a development of the jussive and prohibitive subjunctive. Thus in *manent ingenia senibus, modo permaneat studium et industria,* the original sense was: 'Let only interest and vigor remain! (then) old men's faculties remain.' Cf. the paratactic use of the imperative, e.g. Asin. 240, modo argentum adferto; facile patiar cetera. *Dum,* the commonest particle in these clauses, was probably originally an oblique case of a noun meaning 'while.' Hence in *oderint, dum metuant,* the original sense was: 'Let them fear the while! (then) they may hate.' Some scholars, e.g. Methner, in Glotta, i, p. 251, regard the clause of proviso introduced by *dum* as of temporal origin (*dum* meaning, 'as long as'), but this view fails to account for the negative *ne* employed in these clauses. What Methner says on p. 252 in attempting to explain the negative can hardly be regarded as of weight.

1. **With *dum*** (33) : Bacch. 418, dum caveatur, sine; Capt. 607, volo, dum istic vinciatur; 694, dum pereas, nihil interdico aiant vivere; Cas. 75, mecum pignus dato, Poenus dum iudex siet; 331; Curc. 35, dum ted apstineas nupta, ama quidlubet; 180; 428; 460; 704; Epid. 348, dum tibi placeam atque opsequar, meum tergum flocci facio; 679; Men. 90, dum tu quod edit praebeas, numquam fugiet; Merc. 906, dum istic siet; Most. 71, dum interea sic sit, istuc 'actutum' sino; Pers. 145, me etiam vende, dum saturum vendas; 387; Rud. 746, quid mea refert, dum mihi recte serviant; 1100; Stich. 553, quattuor sane dato dum equidem quod edint addas; 686, convenit, dum quidem veniat cum vino suo; Trin. 58, dum quidem hercle tecum nupta sit, sane velim; 211; Truc. 736, discant, dum mihi commentari liceat; And. 677, capitis periclum adire, dum prosim tibi; Eun. 741, ferre possum, verba dum sint; Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae, dum huic obsequare; Pacuv. 288, illis opitularier quovis exitio cupio, dum prosim; Acc. 204, oderint dum metuant; Trag. Incert. Ribb. 159, pereant amici, dum inimici una intercidant; Lucil. 536, coquos non curat caudam insignem esse,

---

[1] Elste, De *dum* particulae usu Plautino, 1882; Boettger, De *dum* particulae usu apud Terentium et in reliquiis trag. et com., 1887; Richardson, De *dum* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1886; Schmalz, Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, xi, p. 333 ff.

illas dum pinguis siet. In Asin. 166, habeto hac lege, dum superes datis, the proviso clause is substantive, in apposition with *lege*.

2. With *dum ne, dum ni* (21): Aul. 211, dum quidem ne quid perconteris; 491, quo lubeant nubant, dum dos ne fiat comes; Bacch. 866, pacisce quid tibi lubet, dum ne hominem opprimat nive enicet; Capt. 338, quidvis, dum ab re ne quid ores, faciam; 682; Curc. 36, dum ne per fundum saeptum facias semitam, ama quidlubet; Merc. 423, me illam posse opinor vendere. :: dum quidem hercle ne minoris vendas quam ego emi; M. G. 893, dum ne scientes quod bonum faciamus, ne formida; Pers. 657, dum quidem ne nimis diu tua sim, volo; Trin. 979, dum ille ne sis quem ego esse nolo, sis mea caussa qui lubet; And. 902, quidvis cupio, dum ne me falli comperiar; Hec. 634, dum ne reducam, turbent quam velint; Cato, Agr. 5, 4, opus omne curet, dum ne lassus fiat; 33, 1; 50, 2; CIL, i, 196, dum ne minus c senatoribus adesent (ter); 198, 16, dum nequem legat; 198, 30, quod recte factum esse volet, dum neiquid advorsus hanc legem fiat; 198, 63; 199, 31, dum ne intromitat; 41, id uti facere liceat, dum ne ampliorem modum habeant; 202, II, 12, ea lege praecones legunto, dum niquem in eius locum praeconem legant; i, 577, III, 10, dum ni minus xx adsient.

3. With *dum modo* (11): Amph. 644, absit, dum modo laude parta domum recipiat se; 996; Aul. 239, dum modo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis; Epid. 270, facere cupio quidvis, dum id fiat modo; M. G. 253, quantumvis prolationis, dum modo hunc inducamus; 784; H. T. 466, sumat, dum modo habeam; 641; Eun. 320, nil refert, dum potiar modo; Naev. Com. 130, dum ⟨modo⟩ videat; Afran. 408, dum modo doleat aliquid, doleat quid lubet.

4. With *modo*: Eun. 890, volet, civis modo haec sit.

5. With *ut modo, modo ut*: Asin. 274, aetatem velim servire, Libanum ut conveniam modo; Phor. 58, scies, modo ut tacere possis.

Methner, op. cit. p. 246, makes the assertion that the main clause on which provisos introduced by *dum* depend, contains "keine Behauptung, sondern eine Willenserklärung." But he overlooks important material for Early Latin. I have noted the following examples in which the main clause does not express a "Willenserklärung." Barring Amph. 996, which, in my opinion, Methner misinterprets, none of these passages are recognized in his paper:

Curc. 460, quid id refert, dum argentum accipias? Merc. 906, quid refert, dum siet; Pers. 387, dum dos sit, nullum vitium vitio vortitur; Rud. 746, quid mea refert, dum mihi recte serviant? Stich. 687, convenit, dum veniat; Trin. 211, non flocci faciunt, dum illud quod lubeant sciant; Eun. 742, ferre possum, verba dum sint; Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae, dum huic obsequare; Lucil. 536; Aul. 239, dum modo morata recte veniat, dotatast satis; M. G. 784; H. T. 641, quidvis satis est, dum vivat modo; Eun. 320; Amph. 996, quod omnis homines facere oportet, dum modo fiat bono, is cited by M., but I can see no "Willenserklärung" in *facere oportet.*

Dum-Clauses Denoting a Wish.

Different from the *dum*-clauses just discussed, are, in my judgment, the five following examples. These seem to go back rather to an optative origin, embodying, as they do, a wish existing in the mind of the subject of the leading verb. Asin. 428, operam dedo, dum reperiam, 'in my desire to find': Capt. 32, nil pretio parsit dum filio parceret, 'in his desire to save his son'; Merc. 84, dico amorem missum facere me, dum illi obsequar; Pseud. 1282, inde huc exii crapulam dum amoverem; And. 825, dum id efficias quod cupis, neque modum benignitatis neque quid ores, cogitas.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUAMVIS QUANTUMVIS, UT,* 'ALTHOUGH.'

Material falling under this head is extremely rare in Early Latin. I have noted only the following examples: Bacch. 82, locus hic apud nos, quamvis subito venias, semper liber est; Trin. 554, quamvis malam rem quaeras, reperias; Cato, Agr. 1, 6, quamvis quaestuosus siet; Truc. 571, des quantumvis, nusquam apparet; Hec. 296, ut taceam, quoivis facile scitu est.

These apparently have developed from a jussive parataxis, — 'come as suddenly as you will,' etc. Possibly they are still at the paratactic stage.

THE SUBJUNCTIVE IN CONDITIONAL SENTENCES.[1]

The subjunctive in the apodosis of conditional sentences is potential in character and has already been considered in detail above, pp. 197; 201. The present chapter, therefore, will deal only with the employment of the subjunctive in protases.

Origin. The origin of the subjunctive in the protasis of Latin conditional sentences is not altogether clear. Very likely, too, the different types of conditional sentences are not all of the same origin, but are to be referred, some to one source, others to another. Thus, Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 401, refers sentences of the type *si haberem, darem* to an Indo-European optative[2] for their origin. He is led to this in view of the fact that Sanskrit employs the optative in unreal conditions, while the usage is likewise not unknown to Greek; *e.g.* Ψ 274, εἰ μὲν νῦν ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ ἀεθλεύοιμεν Ἀχαιοί, ἦ τ᾿ ἂν ἐγὼ τὰ πρῶτα λαβὼν κλισίηνδε φεροίμην. In the case of conditions of the type *si habeam, dem,* we may very likely, according to Delbrück, have a fusion of subjunctive and optative. Essentially the same are the views of Schmalz (Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 583) and of Hale (Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin, Harvard Studies, xii, p. 109 ff.), except that Hale in addition to the volitive, optative, and potential recognizes also an "anticipatory" subjunctive as participating in the origin of the Latin subjunctive in protases. Nutting, Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 149 ff., dissents from the views of the scholars just cited, particularly so far as the participation of the volitive and true optative is involved in the origin of subjunctive protases in Latin. He would refer the use of the subjunctive in Latin protases (just as the use of optative and subjunctive protases in Greek) to "the vague and shifting meaning

---

[1] Rothheimer, De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis, 1876; Liebig, Die hypothetischen Sätze bei Terenz, 1863; Blase, De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis condicionalibus permutatione, Diss. Phil. Argent. x, p. 94 ff.; Geschichte des Irrealis im Lateinischen, 1888; Lindskog, De enuntiatis apud Plautum et Terentium condicionalibus, 1895; Hale, Origin of Subjunctive and Optative Conditions in Greek and Latin, Harvard Studies, xii, p. 109 ff.; Nutting, The Order of Conditional Thought, Amer. Jour. Phil. xxiv, p. 149 ff.; O. Brugmann, Gebrauch des Kondicionalen NI in der älteren Latinität, 1887; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 400 ff.; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 580 ff.

[2] Delbrück, apparently, does not refer such sentences either to the wish use or the potential use exclusively, but to both; see p. 403.

attached to early mood-forms," a virtual renunciation of any expla-
nation of origin.

Semasiologically the difficulties in the way of a volitive and opta-
tive origin for subjunctive protases will impress most as imaginary.
At all periods of the language, though never frequently, we find
paratactic subjunctives used with conditional force, *e.g.* Cic. Verr. 2,
10, 26, veniat nunc, experiatur: tecto recipiet nemo; N. D. i, 57,
roges me: nihil respondeam.   These two examples both illustrate
how a volitive expression might easily develop into a protasis, and
they lend plausibility to the theory that a conditional period like *si
videat, credat,* for example, may go back to an original *videat: credat,*
'let him see; he would then believe'; *i.e.* 'if he should see, he
would believe.'   In support of this explanation may be cited also the
use of the imperative with the force of a protasis, *e.g. cras petito,
accipiet.*

Si seems originally to have been an adverb meaning 'so.'   The
most primitive form of conditional sentence with *si* would be seen in
an expression like *bene est si: valet,* 'it is well so: (viz. that) he is
well.'   Here *si* limits *bene est,* and *valet* is really an appositive of
the adverbial idea in *si.*   Out of this use, quite probably, has de-
veloped the conjunction *si.*   Cf. English *so* in such expressions as
'so you pay me, I shall be satisfied'; originally, 'I shall be satisfied
so, viz. you pay me.'   Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 581, influ-
enced by such expressions as Lucil. 501, si secubitet, sic quoque non
impetret, explains the use of *si* as arising from an original correla-
tion, *si . . . sic.*   In support of this he cites the German 'so du heute
mit mir speisest, so darfst du glauben.'

To an optative origin might well be referred a sentence of the
type, *si haberem, darem,* originally, 'would that I had; I would give';
i.e. 'if I had, I would give.'

On the whole I am in accord with the views of Delbrück and
Schmalz, though it seems to me more likely that the potential uses
have not contributed to the origin of the subjunctive protasis in
Latin, but that the volitive and optative uses are solely responsible
for the use.

Classification of Subjunctive Protases.

The various formal types of conditional sentences in Early Latin are extremely numerous. They are made the basis of the following classification, while the various logical or functional types, which are few, are made subordinate to the formal categories.

I. PROTASIS IN THE PRESENT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. Apodosis in the present subjunctive (potential) (172). Type *si sit . . . sit.*

a) The time of the protasis is future and it is implied that the content of the protasis is capable of realization (117).

1) Introduced by *si* (104): Amph. 871, mea sit culpa, si id Alcumenae expetat; Asin. 458, si sciat, suscenseat; 895, nauteam bibere malim, si necessum sit; Cas. 573, si neget, amittat; Curc. 211; Poen. 322; Trin. 457; And. 376; H. T. 556; Eun. 355; Pacuv. 130; Stat. 127; Lucil. 40.

2) Introduced by *nisi* (4): Acc. 102, nisi quid tulat, peream; Truc. 564; Men. 454; Stich. 296.

3) Introduced by *nisi si:* Trin. 474, nisi si votet. *Si* is here redundant.

4) Introduced by *ni:* Titin. 26, ni nos texamus, nil siet.

5) Introduced by *si non* (3): Cist. 45, si non nubat, familia pereat. Here *non* negatives nubat; *nisi* would fail to convey the requisite meaning. In Afran. 31, and Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 58, 1, the context does not show whether *nisi* might have been employed in case of the *si non* actually used.

6) Introduced by relatives (3): Aul. 230, ubi onus nequeam ferre, iaceam in luto; Pseud. 318; Hec. 742.

b) The time of the protasis is the present, and it is implied that the content of the protasis is contrary to fact (51). It is not always easy to determine whether a given protasis belongs under *a*) or *b*). A number of passages bear either interpretation. I have endeavored to exercise conservatism in admitting examples to category *b*).

1) Introduced by *si* (43): Asin. 188, si nunc habeas quod des, alia verba praehibeas; 393, si sit domi, dicam tibi; Bacch. 46, si habeat aurum, faciat; 635, si mihi sit, non pollicear? Capt. 238,

si audeam, nominem; Cist. 116, si possim, velim; Epid. 331, si habeam, pollicear; Men. 504, non negem, si noverim; 640, haud rogem, si sciam; M. G. 1256, sentiat, si intus sit; 1371; 1429; Most. 895; Pers. 44; And. 276; 310; 652; 914; Phor. 171; Enn. Trag. 271; Pacuv. 407.

2) Introduced by *nisi* (3): Bacch. 636, nisi ames, non habeam; Stich. 190; 508.

3) Introduced by *ni* (5): Men. 110, ni stulta sies, tibi odio habeas; M. G. 1284; Poen. 877; Rud. 1418; And. 551.

An examination of the foregoing material cited under *a*) and *b*) shows that in Early Latin a protasis in the present subjunctive may indicate either something whose future realization is suggested as possible or something which is clearly implied to be contrary to fact.[1] Only the context can determine what type we have in any special case, and, as already intimated, even the context is not always sufficient to settle the question, as several examples admit of either interpretation. See Rothheimer, De enuntiatis conditionalibus Plautinis, p. 36; Blase, Geschichte des Irrealis, p. 13 ff.

c) The action of the protasis is achronistic and the subject is the indefinite 2d singular (see p. 319, below) (3): Amph. 705, si obsequare, una resolvas plaga; Cist. 33, si adeas, abitum malis; 96, si ames, consulas.

2. Apodosis in the present indicative (103). Type, *si sit . . . est.*[2]

a) Introduced by *si* (75): Asin. 164, si ductem, referre gratiam numquam potes; 318, si conferant, habeo; Aul. 558, interbibere, si vino scatat, Pirenam potest; Asin. 933, si aliud nil sit, pudet; Aul. 254, neque si cupiam, copiast; Bacch. 128, si habeas, addecet; 1003, non laturus sum, si iubeas; Capt. 850, scis bene esse, si sit unde; 906, si memorem, morast; Curc. 299, recte monstrat, si imperare possit; Merc. 298, si scias, plus video; 430, si velim, dantur; M. G.

---

[1] So also in Sanskrit and occasionally in Greek; see below, p. 278.

[2] Langen, Beiträge zum Plautus, 1881, p. 43 ff.; Lilie, Conjunctivischer Bedingungssatz bei indikativischem Hauptsatz im Lateinischen, 1884; Blase, Der Konjunktiv des Präsens im Bedingungssatz, Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, ix, p. 17 ff.; Studien u. Kritiken, 1904, p. 15 ff.; De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis condicionalibus permutatione, p. 5 ff.; Lodge, On the Theory of the Ideal Condition in Latin, Studies in Honor of Basil L. Gildersleeve, p. 253 ff.; Nutting, Classical Review, xvii, p. 449 ff.; University of California Publications, Classical Philology, i, p. 35 ff.

685, bona uxor suave est, si sit usquam gentium ubi inveniri possit; 1263; H. T. 632, si neges, scio; Phor. 738, si possim, nihil est; Hec. 266; Ad. 202. Of the 75 subjunctive protases falling under this head, 18 are of the indefinite 2d singular (see below, p. 320): Bacch. 440, si attingas, puer dirumpit caput; Capt. 202, animo si bono utare, adiuvat; Cas. 721; Epid. 674; Men. 103, standum est in lecto, si petas; M. G. 673; Pers. 449; Poen. 635; 636; 812; Trin. 349; 1053; And. 637, si roges, nil pudent; Ad. 28; 29; 32; Trag. Incert. Ribb. p. 280, aperte fatur, si intellegas; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) p. 83, 5; si exerceas conteritur.

b) Introduced by *nisi* (8): Ad. 943, non (omitto), nisi exorem; Truc. 234; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1. Three of these are in the indefinite 2d singular, Capt. 222, doli non doli sunt, nisi astu colas; Truc. 461; Acc. 215.

c) Introduced by *ni* (5): Hec. 473, possum, ni velim; Phor. 544; 547; And. 918, ni metuam patrem, habeo illum quod moneam; Pacuv. 277.

d) Introduced by *si non:* Rud. 159, si non moneas, meminimus; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 6, si non exerceas (indef. 2d sing.), tamen rubigo interficit.

e) Introduced by *si nihil:* Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 7, si nihil exerceas, inertia plus detrimenti facit (indef. 2d sing.).

f) Introduced by *si modo:* Pseud. 997, id ago, si modo taceas.

g) Introduced by *et si, tam etsi:* Truc. 815, etsi taceas, intellego; Eun. 216, memini, tam etsi nullus moneas.

h) Introduced by *sin:* And. 165, sin eveniat, restat.

i) Introduced by relatives (5): Bacch. 992, verum qui satis videat, satis grandes sunt; Curc. 590; Epid. 536; Pseud. 438; Cato, Agr. 16, 1.

Substantive *si*-clauses occur in Asin. 528, an te id exspectare oportet, si quis promittat; And. 568, incommoditas huc redit, si eveniat discessio.

In several of the above passages, the present subjunctive has contrary-to-fact force, e.g. M. G. 685; Hec. 471; And. 918.

3. The apodosis is in the future indicative (21). Type, *si sit . . . erit.*

a) Introduced by *si* (20): Asin. 414, si dicas, numquam effugies; 699, vehes me, si speres; Aul. 311, si roges, numquam dabit; Curc.

186; Merc. 650; Poen. 729; H. T. 594; fiet : : si sapias; Phor. 229; Stat. 113, audibis, si redeat; Cato, Agr. 6, 3; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 232. There are two instances of the indefinite 2d singular: Amph. 703, si velis adversarier, insaniorem facies; Cato, 95, 2, si in tecto coquas, excandescet.

b) Introduced by *ni:* Bacch. 1171a, ni abeas, malum tibi dabo.

4. The apodosis consists of *quid* (30). Type: *quid, si sit?* Capt. 612, quid si adeam; so also Cist. 321; Curc. 145; 303; Epid. 543; Poen. 330; Amph. 313, quid, si tangam? Bacch. 732, quid, si scribat? Cas. 357; H. T. 719; Eun. 369.

5. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive (3). Type: *si sit, quid agam?* Asin. 506, ubi piem Pietatem, si postulem? Bacch. 79; Ad. 784 (with *nisi*).

6. The apodosis is a jussive or prohibitive subjunctive (9). Type: *si sit, abeas.* Asin. 120, si velis, mandes; Aul. 100, si Bona Fortuna veniat, ne intromiseris! Men. 502, si aequom facias, odiosus ne sies! Rud. 680a, si modo id liceat, vis ne opprimat! Ad. 372; Aul. 489, hoc qui dicat, . . . nubant, also belongs here, though it involves an anacoluthon. There is one instance of the indefinite 2d singular, Phor. 688, si quid velis, huic mandes!

7. The apodosis stands in the imperative (7). Type: *si sit, fac.* Asin. 445, si velis, commoda amico! Men. 52, si quis curari sibi velit, imperato! Hec. 493, si sanus sies, iube redire! Lucil. 177; Cato, Agr. 40, 4, obtegito, si pluat ('against the possibility of rain').

8. The apodosis stands in the perfect (potential) subjunctive (11). Type: *si sit, dixerim.* Amph. 510, illa si sciat, ego faxim; Bacch. 1055, qui dicat, haud cum illo ausim; Cas. 424, si me suspendam, operam luserim et fecerim et creaverim; Epid. 258, si aequom siet, dederim; M. G. 669; Poen. 886; Rud. 978; Hec. 424, aufugerim, si eo mihi redeundum sciam; Titin. 120; Pacuv. 12, 13.

9. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative: Curc. 226, si non ferat, non potuit retineri; Pseud. 433, si sint vera, quid mirum fecit?

10. The apodosis stands in the imperfect subjunctive. The condition is contrary to fact: Aul. 523, compellarem, ni metuam; Truc. 830, vinum si fabulari possit, se defenderet; Poen. 1251, si possit, (posset? *A*) id ego evenisset vellem.

11. There is no apodosis, but the present subjunctive with *si* or *si*

modo is equivalent to a wish (4): Capt. 996, modo si possit; Trin. 1187, si facias (Cam.; facies, *CD*; faciaes, *B*) modo; Eun. 647; also Poen. 550, omnia istaec scimus; si hi spectatores sciant, which calls for a strong mark of punctuation after *scimus*, not a comma, the usual punctuation.

12. A jussive subjunctive serves as protasis, e.g. H. T. 643, melius peius, prosit obsit, nil vident nisi quod lubet; see also p. 178.

13. Present and perfect are combined in the protasis in Trin. 83, si suspicer, si non feceris, atque mihi lubeat, qui potes?

14. The apodosis is involved in some word not a verb (4): Pseud. 87, vix, si me opponam; Trin. 27, invitus, ni me invitet fides; Phor. 170, beatus, ni unum desit; Eun. 50. In the last three examples the protasis is contrary to fact.

15. The apodosis is not expressed (17): Bacch. 698, immo si audias; Cas. 668, immo si scias; so also Curc. 321; Pseud. 749; H. T. 599; 764; 771; Cist. 734, sine dicat : : si dicat quidem; Cas. 743, cena modo si sit cocta; Merc. 724. In H. T. 658, nescio, nisi quaeras, the protasis depends not upon *nescio*, but upon something to be supplied in thought.

16. The protasis is modified by a second protasis (3): Merc. 826, faxim, si plectantur, si scortum duxerit, plures sint vidui; Poen. 864; Trin. 217.

II. Protasis in the Perfect Subjunctive.

1. The apodosis stands in the present (potential) subjunctive (26). Type: *si fuerit, sit.*

Introduced by *si:* Asin. 878, possis, si conspexeris, cognoscere? 603; Aul. 344; 610; 749; Bacch. 311, sit carior, si circumduxerit; 1102, si plus perdiderim, minus aegre habeam; Men. 163; Merc. 518, possin tu, si usus venerit, subtemen nere? Most. 555, dicam, si confessus sit; Pers. 283; Poen. 147; Pseud. 339; 981; Rud. 476; Trin. 468; 538; 693; 950; Truc. 344; H. T. 1035; Eun. 387; 862; Hec. 609; Enn. Trag. 261; Lucil. 342.

2. Type: *quid si fecerit?* Capt. 599, quid si fecerit? Rud. 472.

3. The apodosis is a deliberative subjunctive: only Amph. 155, quid faciam, si me in carcerem compegerint?

4. The apodosis is in the present indicative: Amph. 741, tua istuc

refert, si curaveris. The two following have the indefinite 2d singular: Poen. 213, nullae res si forte occeperis, plus negoti habent; Trin. 1051, si quoi dederis, fit perditum.

5. **The apodosis is in the future indicative:** only Hec. 330, si factus siet, comminiscentur.

6. **The apodosis is in the perfect subjunctive:** H. T. 316, si quid te fugerit, ego perierim; Truc. 60.

7. **The apodosis is a jussive or prohibitive subjunctive (7):** Asin. 794, si tussire occepsit, ne sic tussiat; 806, si forte dixerit, reddat; 785; M. G. 1362; Trin. 347, bene si feceris, ne pigeat; 348, ut potius pudeat, si non feceris (the last two illustrate the indef. 2d sing.); Cato, Agr. 14, 3.

8. **The main protasis is modified by a second protasis:** Aul. 380, festo die si quid prodegeris, profesto egere liceat, nisi peperceris (indef. 2d sing.); Stich. 191, lumbos diffractos velim, ni perierit, si cenassit.

In two of the foregoing examples the perfect protasis is contrary to fact, and refers to the past; viz. Most. 555, dicam, si confessus sit; H. T. 1035, non, si ex capite sis meo natus, patiar. Other instances where the perfect subjunctive protasis refers to the past (though not contrary to fact) are: Poen. 213; Trin. 347; 348; 1051.

III. PROTASIS IN THE IMPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. **The apodosis is also in the imperfect subjunctive (63).** Type: *si esset, esset.*

Originally, apparently, the present subjunctive in both protasis and apodosis was employed in conditions contrary to fact. So in Sanskrit the present optative was used, and at least once in Homer (Ψ 274) we find the present optative in such a conditional sentence. Cf. Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], 584, " Ursprünglich hatten die Konjunktive der einzelnen Zeiten die ihren Indikativen entsprechende temporale Geltung. Daher bezog sich *si haberem, darem* nur auf die Vergangenheit . . . und *si dem, habeam* wurde auch für den Irrealis der Gegenwart gebraucht. Dies können wir für Plautus noch konstatieren." Cf. also Lindskog, De enuntiatis condicionalibus Plautinis, p. 89.

It was owing to the ambiguity of *si dem, habeam,* therefore, that a new form for the present condition contrary-to-fact was called into existence, viz. the imperfect subjunctive, which previously had served to express *past* conditions contrary-to-fact. The place of the imperfect was now taken by the pluperfect. Examples of the imperfect in conditional sentences referring to the past[1] are : Aul. 742, deos credo voluisse : nam ni vellent, non fieret ; Asin. 678, numquam facerem, genua ni tam nequiter fricares ; Ad. 106, si esset unde fieret, faceremus ; Acc. 614. Aul. 439, cited by Blase, De modorum temporumque . . . permutatione, p. 5, does not seem to me to refer to the past. In the five following examples the apodosis refers to the past, the protasis to the present : Amph. 525, nisi te amarem plurimum, non facerem ; Bacch. 916 ; Cas. 556 ; Trin. 115, si mi inimicus esset, haud crederet ; 957.

Other examples of the imperfect in both members of conditional sentences are : —

a) Introduced by *si* (43) : Cas. 811, si equos esses, esses indomabilis ; M. G. 1262, videres, si amares ; Aul. 440 ; Pers. 45, si id esset mihi, pollicerer ; Poen. 691 ; Pseud. 640, si intus esset, provocarem ; 1236 ; Rud. 202 ; 553 ; Eun. 176, si crederem, possem ; 446 ; Phor. 9 ; 207 ; Hec. 249 ; Pacuv. 391, si adesset, commiseresceret.

b) Introduced by *ni* (13) : Asin. 860, ni vera ista essent, numquam faceret ea ; Bacch. 554, ni esset, orarem ; Pseud. 1320, ni doleres, ego dolerem ; Phor. 269 ; 278 ; Hec. 7b.

c) Introduced by *nisi* (3) : Amph. 525, nisi amarem, non facerem ; Most. 844 ; And. 578.

d) Introduced by *qui :* Eun. 487, nemo posset qui haberet.

2. **The apodosis is in the pluperfect subjunctive** (15). Type : *si esset, fuisset.* Asin. 396, si adesset, recepisset ; Men. 241, invenissemus, si viveret ; 460 ; M. G. 1318 ; Pers. 173, ovis si in ludum iret, potuisset ; H. T. 230 ; Ad. 525.

In the following instances[2] the protasis refers to the past : Asin. 396 ; Bacch. 486 ; Rud. 590, si invitare nos paulisper pergeret, ibidem obdormissemus ; Stich. 742 ; Pers. 173.

---

[1] See Blase, De modorum temporumque in enuntiatis condicionalibus Latinis permutatione, p. 5 ff.

[2] Cf. Blase, De modorum temporumque . . . permutatione, p. 8.

3. **The protasis consists of a jussive subjunctive** (5).   Type: *absque hoc esset, haberem.*   Bacch. 412, absque te esset, ego illum haberem; Capt. 754, absque hoc esset, usque me ductarent; Men. 1022; Pers. 836; Trin. 832, absque foret te, distraxissent me; 1127; Phor. 188; Hec. 601, quam fortunatus sum absque una hac foret!

This usage seems to be modelled on the use of the present in protasis (p. 277).

4. **The apodosis is in the perfect indicative** (9): Bacch. 819, hunc si ullus deus amaret, mortuom esse oportuit; M. G. 803, non potuit reperire, si ipsi Soli quaerendas dares, lepidiores; Most. 443, potuit exspectatior venire qui te nuntiaret mortuom; 462, quo modo potui, si non tangerem? Pseud. 792; Pers. 594, paene in foveam decidi, ni adesses; Trin. 566, licitumst, si velles; Pseud. 285, fuit occasio, si vellet, argentum ut daret; H. T. 916, quot res dedere ubi possem persentiscere, ni essem lapis! In all these examples the imperfect is most naturally taken as referring to the past.

5. **The apodosis is in the imperfect indicative**: Bacch. 563, non erat copia, nisi occiperes?   Lucil. 150, si id satis esse potisset, hoc sat erat.

6. **The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative**: Stich. 512, magis par fuerat, nisi nollem; M. G. 53, ni hebes machaera foret, uno ictu occideras.   In this last the imperfect refers to the past.

7. **The apodosis is an optative subjunctive**: only Aul. 645, di me perdant, si abstuli nive adeo abstulisse vellem.

8. **The apodosis is an historical infinitive**: only Trin. 837, scindere vela, ni tua pax foret praesto; where *foret* refers to the past.

9. Type: *quid si faceret?* only Phor. 645, quid, si filiam locaret?

10. **The apodosis consists of an imperfect subjunctive followed by the pluperfect**: only Ad. 770, si meus esses : : dis esses, rem constabilisses.

11. **The main protasis is followed by a second**: only Men. 239, si acum quaereres, invenisses, si appareret.

12. **The apodosis is implied in the context**: Phor. 302, dixisti pulcre: si quidem quisquam crederet.

IV.   PROTASIS IN THE PLUPERFECT SUBJUNCTIVE.

1. **The apodosis is in the imperfect subjunctive** (41): Type: *si fuisset, esset.*

a) Introduced by *si* (28): Asin. 502, si esses percontatus, crederes; Aul. 828, quid faceres, si repperissem; Curc. 700, si voluisset, mitteret; Merc. 993, si scissem sive dixisset, numquam facerem; Capt. 871; M. G. 29; Trin. 568; And. 479; Phor. 119; 393: Ad. 178.

b) Introduced by *ni* (7): Bacch. 217, ni nanctus essem, dicerem; 1209, neque haec faceremus, ni vidissemus; Cist. 625; Phor. 155; 369; 826; Hec. 220.

c) Introduced by *nisi:* only Bacch. 1207, nisi fuissent nihili, non flagitium facerent.

d) Introduced by *si non* (4): M. G. 1320, si non egisset, egeret; Pseud. 1324; Phor. 14. In the first and third of these examples we should normally have had *nisi* or *ni*.

e) Introduced by relatives: Trin. 178, qui emisset, eius essetne pecunia? Phor. 396, quom advenissem, dicerem.

In eight of the foregoing examples the imperfect refers to the past, viz. in Capt. 871; Bacch. 1207; Cist. 625; Curc. 700; Merc. 994; M. G. 29; Trin. 568. See Blase, De modorum temporumque permutatione, p. 9 f.; but Blase includes some other examples which are hardly cases in point.

One passage occurs in which we have a 'should'-'would' condition from a past point of view, M. G. 720, si ei forte fuisset febris, censerem emori: cecidissetve ebrius aut de equo uspiam, metuerem ne ibi diffregisset crura. There is nothing contrary to fact in this expression (notwithstanding the fact that it is preceded by a contrary-to-fact period in v. 719). We rather have an original *si fuerit, metuam*, etc., looked at from the past.

2. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect subjunctive (21). Type: *si fuisset, fuisset.*

a) Introduced by *si* (17): M. G. 718, si habuissem, cepissem; Trin. 927, si appellasses, respondisset; And. 604, si quiessem, nil evenisset; 808, si scissem, numquam huc tetulissem pedem; H. T. 157; Eun. 672; Phor. 20.

b) Introduced by other particles (4): Trin. 172, fecisset, ni praesensisset; Aul. 669; Hec. 289, si non (= nisi) rediisses, factae essent ampliores; Plaut. Frag. 117, nisi fugissem, praemorsisset.

3. The apodosis stands in the present subjunctive: only Stich. 510, vocem te, nisi dixisset.

4. The apodosis stands in the imperfect indicative: only Cist. 152, si tacuisset, eram dicturus.

5. The apodosis stands in the perfect indicative (4): Merc. 694, decem si vocasset, nimium obsonavit; Truc. 140; H. T. 164, si voluisses, oportuit; Curc. 449, si forent conclusi, non potuere.

6. The apodosis stands in the pluperfect indicative: Phor. 536, si pote fuisset, promissum fuerat; And. 691, potuerat, si quiesset.

7. Type: *quid si fecisset?* And. 102, quid si amasset? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 60, 3.

8. The apodosis stands in the present indicative: only And. Alter Ex. 5, non nova istaec condiciost, si voluissem.

Conditional Sentences in which the Protasis has Adversative ('Concessive') Force.[1]

In a considerable number of passages the protasis has the force of 'even if,' the relation usually designated as 'concessive' but which is more accurately designated as 'adversative.' The material (much of it already cited in our classification) is as follows:

a) Introduced by *si* (17): Asin. 414, si quidem summum Iovem te dicas detinuisse atque is precator adsiet, malam rem effugies numquam; Aul. 100, si Bona Fortuna veniat, ne intromiseris! 555, quos si Argus servet, is numquam servet; Bacch. 128, qui si decem habeas linguas, mutum esse addecet; 697; Asin. 318; Bacch. 1045; Cist. 3; Curc. 211; Merc. 841; Pseud. 433; H. T. 452, satrapa si siet amator, numquam sufferre eius sumptus queat; 632, si tu neges, certo scio; 1035; Eun. 49, non (redeam), si me obsecret; Ad. 761, ipsa si cupiat Salus, servare prorsus non potest hanc familiam.

b) Introduced by *etsi* (5): Aul. 421, etsi taceas, palam id quidem est; Trin. 474, etsi votet, edim; Truc. 815, etsi tu taceas, intellego. In Capt. 856 and Vid. Frag. xiii, the apodosis is a dependent clause of result, and the subjunctive protasis may be due to attraction.

c) Introduced by *tametsi:* Trin. 679, datur ignis, tam etsi ab inimico petas (indef. 2d sing.); Eun. 216, memini, tam etsi nullus moneas.

d) Introduced by *etiamsi:* only Ad. 851, etiam si nolit, cogam.

---

[1] Kriege, De enuntiatis concessivis apud Plautum et Terentium; Nutting, Concessive *si*-clauses in Plautus, University of California Publications, Classical Philology, i, p. 35 ff.

Subjunctive Protasis with Indicative Apodosis.[1]

The material falling under this head has been cited with considerable fullness above, p. 274 ff. Concerning the significance of the phenomenon, there has been much discussion. Lilie (op. cit.) defended the theory that in periods of the type under consideration the apodosis is expressed absolutely, i.e. without reference to the content of the protasis, a view which subsequent scholars have justly rejected. Lodge (op. cit., p. 255 ff.) seems to explain the indicative partly as due to the future outlook of the verb, partly as involving an unexpressed apodosis.

The most complete and satisfactory treatment of this question is by Nutting (University of California Publications, Classical Philology, i, p. 50 ff.). Nutting, p. 65, in summing up the reasons why certain conditional sentences in Plautus fail to conform to the logical norm, recognizes four grounds:

1. "The fact that the state of affairs mentioned in the apodosis is often in no way dependent on the truth of the protasis; the indicative statement includes and implies what *would be* in the supposed case," e.g. M. G. 764, otium rei si sit, possum expromere, where, as Nutting observes, "the speaker's fund of information is a fact uninfluenced by the truth or falsity of the condition."

2. "The modal meaning of certain verbs, notably *posse.*"

3. "The union of a complete sentence and a part of another by anacoluthon. The form of each member of the expression is determined by the thought it is to convey, irrespective of the other member," e.g. Capt. 850, scis bene esse, si sit unde; M. G. 1263, non tu magis amas quam ego, si per te liceat; Stich. 171, nunc si ridiculum hominem quaerat quispiam, venalis ego sum. Cf. Blase, Studien u. Kritiken, p. 52, where Epid. 730, invitus do hanc veniam tibi, nisi cogar is explained as a contamination of *invitus do, sed cogor* and *nisi cogar, non dem.*

4. "The somewhat undeveloped state of the language in Plautus's day, as shown (a) in irregular sentence structure and (b) in the not very precise use of mood forms. This method of explanation finds its most sweeping application in cases referring to the future; for

[1] For the literature on this topic, see above, p. 274. Also especially Wimmerer, Wiener Studien, xxvii, p. 264; Sjögren, Gebrauch des Futurums, p. 119.

there the fact that the realms of indicative and subjunctive were not carefully differentiated tended to make the lack of symmetry in sentence structure still less noticeable to Plautus than it would otherwise have been."

Besides the foregoing four lines of explanation of the employment of the indicative in combination with a subjunctive protasis, Nutting also calls attention to the large number of protases with adversative ('concessive') force. In these the absence of formal symmetry is less striking, since, as Nutting (op. cit. p. 67) remarks, "the conclusion refers regularly to a state of affairs actually existing and which would continue to exist despite the coming to pass of what is supposed in the *si*-clause."

Another important category comprises those conditional periods in which an indicative apodosis is combined with a subjunctive protasis in the indefinite 2d singular. See below, p. 319.

Dependent Conditional Sentences.

Conditional sentences often become dependent. As a rule their form under these circumstances offers nothing worthy of note. The following examples, however, deserve attention:

1. **The apodosis serves as an indirect question**: Capt. 712, cogitato, si quis tuos servos faxit, qualem haberes gratiam; Cist. 3, soror si mea esses, qui magis potueris mi honorem ire habitum, nescio; Pers. 296, scis quid dicturus fuerim, ni linguae moderarier queam; And. 258, si rescissem, quid facerem, si quis roget; Gracchus (Meyer), p. 233, si vellem verba facere, haud scio an impetrassem.

2. **The apodosis is a result clause**: Phor. 108, vestitus turpis (erat), ut, ni vis boni in ipsa inesset forma, haec formam exstinguerent; Hec. 128, ita aegre tulit, ut, si adesset, commiseresceret; Ad. 273, ut, si omnes cuperent, nil possent.

3. And. 530, haud dubiumst quin, si nolit, possim; Ad. 299, nunc est illud quom, si conferant, nil adferant; Trin. 1170, metuo, si denegem, ne putes; Cas. 260, quid iam? : : quia, si facias recte, me sinas curare ancillas; Pers. 172, te iam sector quintum annum, quom interea, credo, ovis si in ludum iret, potuisset iam fieri ut litteras sciret; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem, si elocutus essem? (= *peribo si elocutus ero*, dependent on a past tense).

CLAUSES OF CONDITIONAL COMPARISON.[1]

These seem to have originated by ellipsis from ordinary conditional clauses. Thus Aul. 369, verba facio quasi negoti nil siet, is equivalent to *verba facio, ut faciam, si negoti nil siet.*[2]

1. **With** *quasi* (112).

a) *quasi*, 'as if,' (87).

1) A main clause, often with *tam, ita, sic, proinde, sirempse*, etc., corresponds to the *quasi*-clause.

Present tense: Amph. 56, sed ego stultior, quasi nesciam vos velle; Aul. 719, sedent quasi frugi sint; Curc. 51, tam a me pudicast quasi soror mea sit; Merc. 314, plane decrepitus senex tantidemst, quasi sit signum pictum in pariete; Poen. 845, proinde habet orationem quasi ipse sit frugi bonae; And. 548, te oro in commune ut consulas, quasi illa tua sit; H. T. 65, proinde, quasi nemo siet, ita attente tute illorum officia fungere; 527; Cato, Agr. 77, cetera omnia, quasi placentam facias, facito; Enn. Trag. 367, quasi lumen de suo lumine accendat, facit.

Perfect tense: Amph. 683, sic salutas quasi dudum non videris; Men. 1101, tam quasi me emeris argento, servibo tibi; Merc. 204; M. G. 934, hanc ad nos mittitote, quasi clanculum missa sit; Poen. 831, quodvis genus ibi hominum videas, quasi Acheruntem veneris; Amph. 74, sirempse legem iussit esse Iuppiter, quasi ambiverit; Ad. 290, iam nunc times quasi numquam adfueris; Cato, Agr. 156, 1, reddet te, quasi nihil ederis.

Imperfect and pluperfect tenses (rare): Amph. 1096, aedes totae confulgebant, quasi essent aureae; Capt. 417, quasi servos esses, mihi opsequiosus fuisti; Epid. 248, coepi ad eos accedere, quasi retruderet med hominum vis; Men. 482, quasi res cum ea esset, coepi adsentari; Epid. 389, coeperam med excruciare quasi quid filius meus deliquisset. For instances of the imperfect and pluperfect following a principal tense, see below.

2) Without governing clause; used especially to characterize some statement or suggestion as absurd: Amph. 89, quasi vero novom

---

[1] Sven Tessing, Syntaxis Plautina, p. 66 f. Fuhrmann, De particularum comparativarum usu Plautino, 1869.

[2] For a different view, see Hale, Amer. Jour. Phil., xiii, p. 62 ff.

proferatur; Cas. 333, quasi tu nescias; Epid. 226, quasi non fundis
exornatae multae incedant; Men. 669, quasi non habeam alium locum;
639; Most. 1178, quasi non cras commeream aliam noxiam; Poen.
272, quasi bella sit, quasi reges ductitent; Pseud. 632, quasi mi non
sescenta tanta soli soleant credier; 609; 684; Rud. 99, quasi me tuom
esse servom dicas; so Trin. 891; And. 372, quasi necessus sit; 502,
quasi dicas; 544; H. T. 587, quasi desit locus; 720; Eun. 685,
quasi vero paulum intersiet; Hec. 110, quasi tu non multo malis;
Ad. 223, quasi iam usquam tibi sint xx minae; 271; perfect: Merc.
957, quasi tu numquam quicquam adsimile feceris; Truc. 292, quasi
vero corpori reliqueris tuo potestatem coloris ulli capiendi; And.
499, quasi non renuntiata sint haec.

b) *quasi*, 'than if': Aul. 231, tu me magis haud respicias gnatus
quasi numquam siem; Trin. 266, peius perit quasi saxo saliat;
Truc. 340, me nemo magis respiciet quasi abhinc ducentos annos
fuerim mortuos.

c) Introducing substantive clauses. See Bennett, Die mit *tam-*
quam und *quasi* eingeleiteten Substantivsätze, Wölfflin's Archiv,
xi, p. 405 ff.

With *simulo:* Pers. 84, simulabo quasi non videam; Asin. 796; Pers.
677; Curc. 391; M. G. 796; 909; Amph. 200, quasi adfuerim simulabo.

With *adsimulo:* M. G. 1181, adsimulato quasi gubernator sies;
Amph. 115; M. G. 1170; Poen. 600; Epid. 195; M. G. 1163;
Stich. 84, adsimulabo quasi quam culpam admiserint; Eun. 461.

With *dissimulo:* Cas. 771, dissimulat quasi nil sciat; M. G. 992,
dissimulato quasi non videam.

With *consimile est:* M. G. 820, consimilest quom stertas quasi
sorbeas. The *quasi*-clause here stands in the relation of a genitive
dependent upon *consimile*.

Less certain, but to my mind of like nature, are the following:
Pseud. 1162, allegavit hunc quasi a milite esset; Trin. 1142, meo
adlegatu venit quasi qui aurum mihi ferret; Epid. 370, caput im-
prudens alligabit quasi argentum acceperit; Poen. 1102, adseras
quasi filiae tuae sint.

d) *quasi si:* Amph. 1078, nec secus est quasi si ab Acherunte
veniam; Cas. 45, educavit quasi si esset ex se nata. The psycho-
logical process which has produced the redundant *si* is not clear.

2. With *quam si* (12).

a) *quam si*, 'as if,' formula of adrogatio in Gell. v, 19, uti tam filius sit quam si ex eo natus esset; Men. 969, uti tutetur quam si adsit; Scipio, Meyer, p. 212, filium adoptivom tam procedere, quam si ex se natum habeat.

b) *quam si*, 'than if': Bacch. 518, nihilo pluris referet quam si mortuo narret logos; 410; Capt. 273, nec secus erat quam si essem familiaris; Pers. 354; Pseud. 102; Rud. 218; 410; Trin. 410; Eun. 62, nihilo plus agas quam si des; Cato, Agr. 69, 2, minus quam si picare velis.

3. With *ut si* (6). Not found before Terence. Eun. 116, coepit studiose omnia docere ut si esset filia; Phor. 409, itidem ut cognata si sit, abduc hanc; Lucil. 9, 7, insidias facere ut si hostes sint; 274; 458; 576 (uti, *codd.*).

4. With *tamquam*: Pers. 638, tamquam quaeras; Cato, Agr. 87, facito tamquam faex fiat.

5. With *tamquam si*: Most. 402, tamquam si nemo in aedibus habitet; Asin. 427, tamquam si claudus sim, est ambulandum.

6. With *ac si*: Hec. 279, numquam secus habui ac si ex me esset nata.

7. With *ut quasi si*: Asin. 838, quem videam aeque esse maestum, ut quasi dies si dicta sit.

As regards the employment of tenses in these clauses of conditional comparison, there is little to note. In the main, usage conforms to the regularly recognized classical standard, i.e. the present and perfect are used after principal tenses, where English usage would lead us to expect the imperfect and pluperfect. The only exceptions that I have noted are: Rud. 218, qui minus servio quam si serva forem nata? old formula in Gellius, v, 19, uti tam filius siet quam si ex eo natus esset; Phor. 382, proinde expiscare quasi non nosses; 388, quasi non nosses, advenis; CIL, i, 202, I, 39, sirempse iuus lexque esto, quasi si ei viatores in eam decuriam antea lectei sublectei essent.

DESCRIPTIVE CLAUSES.

The name "descriptive" is applied to those clauses which express a characteristic or quality of a person or thing. The designation is due to Professor Hale, who in his earlier syntactical work employed also the names, "characterizing" and "qualitative." Descriptive clauses are opposed to 'determinative,' clauses, which simply add another fact or item with regard to a person or thing. Professor Hale (Hale-Buck, Lat. Gramm., p. 260, footnote) defines the determinative clause as one telling what person or thing is meant; while the descriptive clause is defined as designating what kind of person or thing is meant.

Descriptive clauses may be introduced not merely by the relative pronoun, but also by various relative adverbs, as *ubi, unde, quo,* etc. Theoretically any type of independent subjunctive may appear in a descriptive clause. But as a matter of fact the usage is confined mainly to developments of the 'should' - 'would' potential.

Classification of Subjunctive Descriptive Clauses.

1. Potential Descriptive Clauses (Hale, *Cum*-Constructions, p. 88).

a) Present Tense (49): Asin. 118, servos peior . . . nec quo ab caveas aegrius. Here the idea is: 'nor against whom you would find it harder to be on your guard.' Other examples are: Aul. 320, sescenta sunt quae memorem, si sit otium; 420; Capt. 346, neque quemquam fideliorem neque quoi plus credat; 348; Cist. 110; 545; Epid. 258, consilium dederim quod laudetis; Men. 220; M. G. 686; Pseud. 599; Rud. 211; 1073; 1322; Phor. 488, dicam quod libenter audias; 554; Ad. 299, nunc illud est quom nil adferant; Naev. Com. 98, illo te ducam ubi non despuas; Curc. 481, ibi sunt quos credas male; Afran. 396.

Especially common in this use are phrases like *nihil est quod malim,* e.g. Asin. 877; Bacch. 859; 875; Capt. 516, nunc illud est quom mavelim; And. 963; H. T. 267; Hec. 794; Capt. 53, est quod vos monitos voluerim; 700; Cas. 183a; 951.

Further with expressions of being able, daring, e.g. Pers. 27, cum eis belligerem quibus sat esse non queam? Most. 354, ecquis est qui possit? H. T. 574, nemost apud quem audeam.

In all these the idea is of future contingency, not of actuality.

b) Imperfect Tense (6): Eun. 333, nisi nunc quom minume vel-
lem; 561, nemost quem magis cuperem; 686, adulescentulus quem
tu videre velles; 1002; Hec. 756, faciam quod alia non faceret;
Scipio (Meyer, p. 215), vidi saltare, quam saltationem impudicus
servulus honeste saltare non posset.

All of these are simply contrary-to-fact apodoses (with omitted
protasis), introduced by a relative.

2. Descriptive Clauses of Fact (Clauses of Characteristic).[1]

This is a very large category in Early Latin. It seems to have
developed from the previous type (Potential Descriptive Clauses).
Thus under the head of Potential Descriptive Clauses we noticed
the frequency of the type in which the verb of the dependent clause
was *malim, velim, possim, audeam*, etc. Now it is a peculiarity of
these verbs that the force of potentiality is exceedingly slight, — so
slight in fact that it easily passes into that of actuality. Thus Acc.
538, quem neque tueri contra neque fari queas, almost inevitably
passes from the meaning 'whom you would not be able to face' into,
'whom you *are* not able to (cannot) face.' Similarly Capt. 618, si
quid est quod me velis, 'if there is anything which you would wish
of me,' naturally becomes, 'if there is anything which you wish.'[2]
Cf. also Curc. 171, haud quicquamst magis quod cupiam; Pers. 489,
numquam quod nolis volam; Trin. 801, tacere numquam quicquamst
quod queat; Lucil. 517, quod si observas hominem qui audeat. I
have noted in all some 34 examples of this kind. See in addition to
the examples cited: Capt. 154; Cas. 133; Curc. 171; 479; Men. 53;
Merc. 145; 453; M. G. 329; 685; Pseud. 827; Rud. 390; 1110;
Stich. 769; Trin. 155; And. 31; 45; Eun. 272; Phor. 279; 697;
Hec. 240; 573; 608; 750; Enn. Ann. 194, 10; Cato, Agr. 11, 1.

After the descriptive clause of fact once became thoroughly estab-
lished within the limits just indicated, it naturally extended its scope
further, and came to be employed with great freedom in other verbs
than those in connection with which it arose.

---

[1] See especially Hale, *Cum*-Constructions, p. 90 f.

[2] The theory of Dittmar (Studien zur Lateinischen Moduslehre, p. 97 ff.), that
these clauses had a deliberative origin, seems to me lacking in probability. Equally
so the theory of Bottek (Ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Conjunctivs in lateinischen
Nebensätzen, 1899, p. 33), that the origin is to be sought in interrogative potentials,
i.e. that in *nemo exstat qui ibi vixerit*, for example, the original meaning was, 'Who can
have lived there? No one.' Any such use of the potential is unknown in independent
clauses in Latin, and therefore practically impossible in dependent clauses.

In its developed form it occurs in the following categories :

a) *Nullus qui, non ullus qui, nemo qui, non quisquam qui, nihil quod, non quicquam quod.*

1) Introduced by *qui (quae, quod)* : Amph. 509, nullast quam aeque diligam; Aul. 419, homo nullust qui vivat hodie ; Bacch. 543, nullus est quoi non invideant; Cas. 218, nec quicquam quod plus salis habeat; Trin. 543, nemo exstat qui vixerit; Truc. 717, nec quemquam qui sit odio intro mittam ; Phor. 738, nihil est quod verear; Hec. 782, nil est quod sit dignum; Pseud. 774; Stich. 260 ; Trin. 357; 1126; H. T. 988; Eun. 41; 325; 757; Ad. 932; Naev. Trag. 58; Cato, Agr. 54, 5.

2) Introduced by *quin*[1] = *qui non*, Amph. 1054, neque ullast confidentia quin (= quam non) amiserim ; Bacch. 336, nullust quin sciat; 210, non intermittit tempus quin (= quo non) eum nominet; 1012, nil est quin dixerim; Cas. 199, nihil quin subtrahat; Cist. 16, nec fuit quicquam quin placeret; Stich. 208, nemost quin sit male-volus; H. T. 1021, nil est relictum quin sit idem tibi; Hec. 67; Lucil. 8, nemo sit quin sit pater.

b) *quis est qui?*

1) Introduced by *qui,* Amph. 856, ecquis alius Sosia intust qui mei similis siet ? Aul. 810, quis quoi di sint propitii ? Bacch. 92, quid est quod metuas ? So Poen. 884 ; Bacch. 807; Cas. 750, numquid est ceterum quod morae siet ? Curc. 23 ; 86, quisnam istic fluvius quem non recipiat mare ? 301; Epid. 108; 168; Rud. 315; Truc. 295; H. T. 1008, quid est quod peccem ? Eun. 995, num quid est aliud quod non dixeris ?

2) Introduced by *quin:* H. T. 193, quid relicuist quin habeat ? Eun. 179, quam rem voluisti quin perfeceris ?

Rarely the indicative occurs, e.g. Acc. 458, quis erit qui non differet ?

c) *Unus qui, solus qui:* Curc. 248, solus hic homost qui sciat; And. 973, solus est quem di diligant; Lucil. 330, unus modo qui ingenio sit. A single instance of *quin* occurs, Ad. 293, numquam unum intermittit diem quin (= quo non) semper veniat.

d) *Si est qui,* Amph. 271, si quicquamst aliud quod credam; Cist. 67, si quid est quod doleat; Epid. 526; And. 41; 981; H. T. 1024; Eun. 1; Phor. 12.

[1] See Brugmann, Indogerman. Forschungen, iv, p. 226 ff.

e) *Is qui, ille qui, iste qui:* Capt. 271, proxumum quod sit bono, id volo; 473, eos requirunt qui reddant; H. T. 142; Phor. 917, quo redibo ore ad eam quam contempserim? Stich. 261, reliqui ecillam quae dicat; Pseud. 1085. By an extension of usage we also find *id quod* in determinative clauses with the subjunctive, e.g. Ad. 236, enumerasti id quod ad te rediturum putes? Truc. 296, quid id, obsecrost, quod scias?

f) *Pauci qui:* Pseud. 390, pauci sunt qui certi sient; Trin. 221, pauci sint qui sciant. This last may be due to attraction, though it seems probable that the subjunctive would be used apart from this. In Eun. 581, paucae, quae circum illam essent, manent, we have by analogy a determinative clause in the subjunctive.

g) *Alius qui:* Cist. 231, aliorum adfatimst qui faciant; Truc. 81, alium repperit qui plus daret.

h) *Multi qui:* H. T. 232, concurrunt multae opinionem res quae exaugeant; Enn. Trag. 221, multi qui domi aetatem agerent, propter ea sunt improbati; Pers. 8.

i) *Aliquis qui:* Hec. 550, ex aliquo qui diceret; 652, quom esset aliquis qui te appellaret patrem. This last example might be explained by attraction.

j) Clause following an indefinite antecedent denoting a person or thing.

1) Introduced by *qui*. Examples of this class are very numerous: Cas. 194, ancillula quae meast, quae meo sumptu educta siet; Amph. 824, mihi adsunt testes qui adsentiant; 826, alius Amphitruo qui tuam rem curet teque absente munus fungatur tuom; Asin. 85, servom quoi plus in manu sit quam tibi; Aul. 522; Bacch. 991; Capt. 179, meliorem quae mi placeat condicio magis; 466, neque ieiuniosiorem (diem) nec quoi minus procedat; 614, garriet quoi neque pes umquam compareat; Men. 456, adfatimst hominum qui singulas escas edint; Poen. 1174; 1417, dabo quae placeat; Pseud. 392, exquire unum qui certus siet; 725; Rud. 128, qui mulierculas duas secum adduxit quique adornaret sibi ut rem divinam faciat; 313, adulescentem fortem qui tris semihomines duceret; 319, probri plenum qui duceret mulierculas duas secum; Trin. 1019, hominibus qui facile cohiberent manus; H. T. 596, repperisti tibi quod placeat; Eun. 449, facile fit quod doleat; Phor. 170, beatus, ni unum desit,

animus qui istaec ferat; 522; Afran. 62, non desunt mihi qui dent;
Cato, Agr. 35, 1, in loco qui herbosus non siet; 76, 3, in tabula pura
quae pateat pedem; 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

By an extension of usage we find also determinative clauses in the
subjunctive, e.g. Poen. 441, credin quod ego fabuler? Eun. 705,
credis huic quod dicat? So also 711; Acc. 215; Trin. 207, sciunt
id quod rex reginae dixerit, where Brix, following Reiz, reads *quid*
for the Mss. *id quod.*

2) Introduced by *ubi*, Asin. 174, neque fictum neque scriptum
ubi lena bene agat; Capt. 327, est ubi praestet; 1034; 1032; Pers.
76; Pseud. 215; Truc. 72; Ad. 434; Cato, Agr. 35, 1, in loco celso
ubi sol quam diutissime siet; 151, 2, in loco ubi terra tenerrima
erit, ubi aqua propter siet. Note here the alternation between the
future indicative and the subjunctive.

3) Introduced by *quom*, Most. 158, nec quom me melius rear
esse deficatam; H. T. 559, neque commodius erum audivi loqui
neque quom male facere crederem mi impunius licere; Hec. 658,
nunc quom sentiam; Laelius (Meyer, p. 208), in eodem tempore
periit quom vivo opus esset. Most. 691, melius anno hoc non fuit
nec quom (Mss, *quod*) una esca me iuverit magis, may also be put
here. *Quod* seems to me an impossible reading.

4) Introduced by *unde:* Epid. 80, numquam hominem conveni
unde abierim lubentius; Cato, Agr. 42, eum locum unde exsicaveris.

The indicative also occurs in descriptive clauses of the foregoing
type, e.g. Cist. 74, si medicus veniat qui huic morbo facere medicinam
potest; Trin. 547, istest ager in quem omnis mitti decet; Capt. 1000,
ibi demumst locus ubi labore lassitudost exigunda ex corpore;
Merc. 838, ubi mores deteriores increbrescunt, ubique id eripiatur
quod placeat maxume ibi non cupitast civitas.

k) Descriptive Clauses with an Accessory Notion of Cause
('since') or Opposition ('though').

1) Causal Clauses. Descriptive clauses with the accessory no-
tion of cause are very common in Early Latin. The causal notion
develops purely as a result of the context. Thus Aul. 769,
sanus tu non es qui furem me voces; literally, 'you, the sort
of person who calls me thief.' Cf. Bacch. 91, sumne nihili
qui nequeam? 584, te qui viris tuas extentes; 845, non me militem

sed mulierem qui non queam defendere; Afran. 45, di sunt tibi irati qui cogites.

The reason or cause expressed by these clauses is regularly not the motive or impelling cause of action, but the ground for the assertion made by the speaker. It is striking too that the large majority of these clauses stand in either the first or second persons; i.e. 'you, a person of the sort that,' or, 'I, a person of the sort that;' secondarily, 'since you,' 'since I.' The following citations are classified according to persons.[1]

First Person, Bacch. 1132, merito hoc nobis fit qui quidem huc venerimus; Cas. 619, ego, quoi sic eveniant morae; Cist. 680; Epid. 581; Men. 443, inscitus qui postulem; Merc. 701, miserior me quae nupserim; 920, ego stultior qui credam; M. G. 32; 370; 443; Poen. 986, qui scire potui qui sexennis perierim? Pseud. 908; Trin. 929; 937; 1057; And. 97, laudare fortunas meas, qui haberem; 664, mi iratos qui auscultaverim; 750; H. T. 684, quid ni?:: qui adfuerim; 710; Eun. 303; 1033, in me quoi tot congruerint commoda; Ad. 268; 368, mihi qui dedissem egit gratias; Bacch. 511.

Second person, Amph. 1021, tibi di irati sunt, qui sic frangas foris; Bacch. 1169, non homo tuquidem es qui appelles; Capt. 546, si te odit, qui istum appelles Tyndarum; 565; Curc. 66; iniuriu's qui petas; 551; 654, sanan es quae isti committas? Epid. 326, absurde facis qui angas te; Men. 312, non sanus satis qui male dicas tibi; 323; 806; 818; Merc. 292; 686; M. G. 58, amant ted omnes qui sis tam pulcer; 435; 963; Most. 188, erras quae exspectes atque morem geras; 194, stulta's quae putes; 208; Pers. 667; Rud. 104, utrum tu masne an femina, qui illum patrem voces? 1147; Truc. 730; And. 749, sanu's qui me rogites? H. T. 519, te miror qui tantum biberis; 565; 897; 1011; Eun. 802, miseret tui me qui facias; Phor. 471, te incusamus qui abieris; Ad. 852, fortunatus qui isto animo sies; Acc. 554.

Third Person, Amph. 506, hic scitust sycophanta qui quidem meus sit pater; Epid. 574, quor non, quae quidem ex te nata sit; Men. 373, ebriast quae compellet me; M. G. 406; Pers. 699, persim-

---

[1] The theory of Guthmann (Eine Art missbilligender Fragen, p. 3), that in a sentence like *stultus es qui putes* there is an historical connection with the repudiating questions, lacks plausibility.

ilem tui : : quippe qui frater siet; Rud. 118, istic infortunium (volo), qui praefestinet praeloqui; 1113, istae mutae sunt quae pro se fabulari non queant ?   Stich. 555; Trin. 552; Ad. 65, errat qui credat.

All of the foregoing examples are introduced by relative pronouns. A single instance of a relative adverb occurs in Truc. 353, num tibi ianuast mordax quo intro ire metuas.

The indicative is also not infrequent in clauses of the same meaning, e.g. Pers. 75, sed sumne ego stultus qui rem curo publicam? Stich. 558; p. 137 f.   Sometimes the two moods alternate, as Eun. 302, ut illum di perdant, qui me remoratus est; et me qui restiterim; Men. 456.

2) Adversative Clauses.   These are much less frequent in Early Latin than causal descriptive clauses.   So also in later Latin, adversative descriptive clauses are relatively less frequent than causal descriptive clauses.   Examples: Amph. 178, hodie qui fuerim liber, eum nunc potivit pater servitutis; 56, quasi nesciam vos velle qui divos siem; 153, qui me alter est audacior homo, iuventutis mores qui sciam ('although I know'), qui hoc noctis solus ambulem ? Bacch. 331, divesne est ? : : qui auro habeat suppactum solum ? M. G. 530, ut pote quae non sit eadem; so in Cist. 317, editors generally read suspiciost eam esse ut pote quam numquam viderim.   *Ut pote* is Seyffert's conjecture; the Mss. have *postquam*.   Further examples are: M. G. 566, etiam quod sciam ; Poen. 234, te sic fabulari quae tam callida sis; Stich. 395, Hercules, qui deus sies, discessisti non bene; Truc. 587, tu ais, quae sis stabulum flagiti ? Phor. 60.

The indicative is also found in relative clauses with adversative force; see p. 142.

1) *Sunt qui* in Early Latin is regularly followed by the indicative.

3. Jussive Descriptive Clauses.   Material falling under this head is scanty.   Examples: M. G. 140, conclave dedit quo nemo inferret pedem.   This seems to go back to an original, *conclave quo nemo inferat pedem* ('a room into which let no one set foot').   To the same category probably belong also the following examples from Cato: Agr. 21, 1, cupam facito media inter orbis quae conveniat; 2, tabulam ferream figito quae in columellam conveniat.   Less certain is the following: Bacch. 67, (palaestra) ubi pro disco damnum capiam . . . ubi pro insigni sit corolla plectilis, pro lorica capiam pallium, ubi lectus detur, scortum accubet.

4. Deliberative Descriptive Clauses. Here I should put the following: Aul. 735, quid de te demerui, quam ob rem ita faceres ? This, I should regard as a dependent past form of an original *quam ob rem ita facias* ('why should you do so ? '). Poen. 276, quid habetis qui mage immortalis vos credam esse ? Ad. 592, nil reperio quam ob rem lauder. In all these the original interrogative of the deliberative has in the process of development come to be felt as relative.

5. Optative Descriptive Clauses: Pers. 823, di faciant ut id bibatis quod numquam transeat ('what I hope will never go through ').

<h3 style="text-align:center">OTHER RELATIVE CLAUSES.</h3>

1. Jussive: Cato, Agr. 20, 2, cunicas soldas facito, quas figat clavis duplicibus ('which let him fasten ').

2. Optative: Asin. 2, quae res bene vortat; so also, Aul. 788; Capt. 361; Curc. 729; Pers. 329; Trin. 500; 572; Aul. 218, quae res recte vortat; Phor. 678, quae res vortat male; Ad. 191; Curc. 273; Amph. 461, quod illi faxit Iuppiter; Aul. 147; Cas. 382; 402; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, quod bene eveniat; And. 568, quod di prohibeant; Eun. 466.

3. Potential: Hec. 330, si factus siet, quod nolim; Lucil. 194, dies hic, quem hexametro non dicere possis; Statius, 79; Curc. 291, incedunt cum suis sententiis, quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermipolio.

<h2 style="text-align:center">RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES.[1]</h2>

Many descriptive clauses develop secondarily a restrictive notion, e.g. Men. 1106, nil reticebo quod sciam, 'nothing that I know,' and secondarily, 'nothing, so far as I know'; Pseud. 1076, nullumst periculum quod sciam, 'which I know,' and secondarily, 'so far as I know'; Acc. Praetext. 1, nil pericli est quod sciam; Cato, Agr. 148, 1, quod neque aceat neque muceat id dabitur; Men. 297, tantum quod sciam; so Merc. 642; Capt. 265, non ero (falsiloquos), i.e. nihil falsum dicam, quod sciam. From expressions like these the step was easy and natural to others like: Amph. 749, numquam factumst quod sciam; so Capt. 173; Men. 500, non edepol ego te quod sciam vidi; Men. 503, vigilo quod sciam; Most. 1010, minas lx accepisti quod sciam; Truc. 199, uterum, quod sciam, numquam

---

[1] Hale, The Mode in the Phrases *quod sciam*, etc., Trans. Amer. Phil. Assoc. xxii, p. 105 ff.; *Cum*-Konstruktionen, p. 340.

extumescere sensi; Ad. 641, non istas (pepuli) quod sciam; Men. 925, intestinas tibi crepant quod sentias? Hec. 863, numquam eam, quod nossem, videram; Epid. 638, non me novisti? :: (non) quod quidem nunc veniat in mentem mihi; Merc. 1022, scortum ducat quod bono fiat modo; Poen. 440, quod inter nos liceat; And. 454, quod dicendum hic siet; CIL, i, 198, 69, quod sine malo pequlatu fiat; 199, 25, sei non dabunt neque satis facient arbitratu Genuatium, quod per Genuenses mora non fiat; i, 200, 2, agrum, quod non modus maior siet; old Fetial formula in Livy, i, 24, quod sine fraude mea fiat, facio; Cato, Agr. 16, dominus lapidem, ligna, quod opus siet, praebet; Poen. 1213, amicus vobis. :: quiquidem inimicus non siet.

SUBJUNCTIVE IN RESULT CLAUSES.

The clause of result is closely related to the predicative descriptive clause (clause of characteristic), and is probably a development of the potential subjunctive. Thus in a sentence like *hoc flagitium tale est ut quivis oderit,* the original meaning, I take it, was: 'this outrage is of such a nature as[1] any one you please would hate it,' i.e. if he should see it. From this, to the meaning 'of such a nature that anybody you please *hates* it,' is an easy transition. In our study of the descriptive clause of fact (p. 289), we saw that certain potentials, particularly *velit, malit, nolit, audeat, possit, credat, putet,* lent themselves readily to this transition from the idea of contingency to that of actuality. It seems likely that the clause of result has developed by this same process of transition, and in the case of the same verbs. Thus in an original, *nemo est tam audax ut hoc facere audeat,* the meaning 'as would dare' naturally becomes 'that he dares.' So in the case of *nemo est tam fortis ut hoc facere possit; nemo est tam stultus ut velit; nemo est tam stultus ut nolit; ut malit; ut putet; ut credat;* etc. By this process of transition a new syntactical type arises, and *ut* relative becomes *ut* consecutive. After the construction once became established it naturally extended itself far beyond its original bounds, and was employed freely in any context.[2] In Early Latin, however, the type which I have assumed

[1] *Ut* in such sentences seems to have been originally relative.

[2] The foregoing view still seems to me the more probable despite Schlicher (Classical Philology, ii, p. 79 ff.) and Dittmar (Studien zur lat. Moduslehre, p. 87 f.), both of whom refer the construction to the repudiating question for its origin.

as original is still strikingly prevalent. Out of some 106 instances
of result clauses introduced by *ut*, no fewer than 30 contain the
verbs to which I would refer the origin of the construction (*possit*,
audeat, *velit*, etc.). Many of these are of the original type, and
exhibit the ease with which the transition referred to could take
place, e.g. Merc. 36, adeost facundus ut possit loqui ('so eloquent as
would be able,' i.e. so eloquent that he can); M. G. 1174, ita expoli-
tum ut non queas; Phor. 240, ita sum irritatus ut nequeam; 497,
adeon ut neque queas; and many others.

Equally clear is the potential origin in relative clauses of result,
e.g. Amph. 985, nec quisquam tam audax fuat homo qui obsistat
mihi; Curc. 284; Trin. 954, an ille tam esset stultus qui crederet?
Phor. 821, eius modi cupiditates quas mederi possis; Rud. 645, quis
est tanta confidentia qui audeat; H. T. 675, nil tam difficilest quin[1]
investigari possiet. Out of 29 relative clauses of result in Early
Latin, 14 point to the original type. In many cases some interpreters
might prefer to recognize the potential character of the dependent
clause as still persisting.

Result Clauses Introduced by *ut*.[2]

1. With a preceding intensive word.

a) With *ita* (25).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Aul. 591, ita dormitet ut cogitet; Bacch.
477, ita gerere ut teneat; Cas. 125; Poen. 1294; H. T. 503; Ad. 520.

2) Negative, e.g. Men. 19, ita simili ut non posset; M. G. 1174;
Rud. 730, ita te ornatum amittam ut te non noveris; Eun. 869;
Gracchus (Meyer, p. 229), ita versatus sum ut nemo possit. In
Phor. 974, we have illam ita incensam dabo ut ne restinguas. If
ut ne is what Terence wrote, it is unaccountable and unexampled.

b) With *adeo* (18).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Asin. 284, adeo ut sint obnoxii; Bacch. 283,
adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem; Merc. 36; Phor. 497;
Hec. 532.

2) Negative, e.g. And. 278, adeo ingratum ut neque amor neque
pudor commoveat; Eun. 226.

---

[1] For *quin* as a relative (= *qui non*), see p. 290.
[2] Substantive Clauses of Result are treated below.

c) With *tantus* (8).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Asin. 313, tantum facinus inveni ut nos dicamur; And. 626; H. T. 75.

2) Negative, e.g. H. T. 710, tantam potestatem ut non credat; Ad. 610b, hocine tantum ut neque certum sit; Stat. 249, tantam rem ut pro nilo habuerit.

d) With *is* (8).

1) Affirmative, e.g. Cas. 47, adolevit ad eam aetatem ut placere posset; Poen. 1201, non eo genere sumus ut deceat; H. T. 359; Phor. 979.

2) Negative: Phor. 175, in eum incidi locum ut neque sit amittendi nec retinendi copia; Ad. 273, in eum locum redisse ut nil possent auxiliarier.

e) With other words: Hec. 108, tam commode ut committam; Asin. 794, ne sic tussiat ut linguam proserat; Pseud. 929, sic in timorem dabo ut neget neque autumet; Cato, Agr. 158, 2, tot rebus ut bene deicias.

2. Without correlative particle.

a) Affirmative (29), e.g. Pseud. 464, te conficiet ut censeas; 588, praeda onerabo ut sciant; Trin. 76, morbum incuties ut aegroti sient; Hec. 60, iurabat ut quivis posset credere; Ad. 823; Cato, Agr. 151, 4, si non pluet ut terra sitiat; CIL, i, 38, optenui laudem ut laetentur.

b) Negative (11), e.g. Men. 712, quid admisi ut non audeam; M. G. 71; H. T. 394, devincimini ut numquam possit; 881, ex tuo ingenio iudicas ut nil credas intellegere; 899, ut ne . . . quidem subolat; Eun. 841, ut nullo modo possem; Hec. 2, intervenit ut neque potuerit.

Relative Clauses of Result.

1. Introduced by *qui* (13), e.g. Amph. 985, nec quisquam tam audax fuat homo qui obsistat mihi; Curc. 284; Trin. 954; H. T. 679; Phor. 822; Pers. 583, numquam tam benignus fuit qui fuerit propitius; Cato, Agr. 156, 3.

2. Introduced by *qui non* (2), Truc. 355, quid tam inficetu's qui non des; Acc. 683.

3. Introduced by *ubi*: Stich. 62, tantillum loci ubi catellus cubet.

4. Introduced by *quin* (12), e.g. Asin. 944, nec quisquamst tam ingenio duro quin faciat; Aul. 790, nullus tam parvi preti quin purget

sese; Capt. 408; Merc. 362; Ad. 221; Lucil. 140, nulla potest mulier tam corpore duro esse, tamen tenero manet quin (= cui non) sucus lacerto.

In these clauses of relative result an intensifying word is invariably present in the antecedent clause. *Tam,* which was rare in clauses introduced by *ut,* is especially common in these relative clauses, occurring some 18 times.[1]

Substantive Clauses of Result.[2]

Substantive clauses of result are a development of clauses of pure result. The origin of these is seen in a sentence like And. 916, evenit ut veniret, 'it so happened that he came.' But the result notion in such clauses soon became weakened and the substantive force became predominant, so that substantive clauses introduced by *ut* occur where not only no notion of result exists, but where it never could have existed, as e.g. Capt. 583, est miserorum ut malevolentes sint.

Examples:

a) evenit (13), e.g. Bacch. 1069, evenit ut praeda onustus cederem; M. G. 889; And. 916, evenit ut veniret; Phor. 66.

b) contigit: Amph. 187, id contigit ut salvi poteremur domi.

c) fit (14), e.g. Asin. 478, id quidem fiet ut vapules; Pers. 173, potuisset fieri ut litteras sciret; And. 386, (fiet) ut excludar; Lucil. 781; Trin. 429, factum : : ut quidem illud perierit.

d) facio, committo (13): Amph. 185, facit ut quod se sit dignum sciat; Curc. 258; And. 17, faciuntne ut nil intellegant; 55; 583; Trin. 704, id me commissurum ut patiar fieri.

Concerning these clauses with *facio,* Durham, p. 111, expresses the opinion that they are radically different from the clauses considered above, p. 224. In these examples, it will be noted that *facio* has the simple meaning 'to do,' and that the subjects of the main and dependent clauses are identical. The negative too in And. 17 (*ut nil*) seems to point to a non-volitive origin of the dependent clause in these sentences.

---

[1] Genuine potentials also sometimes occur in result clauses, e.g. Rud. 756, tam sincerum ut quivis dicat ampullarius; And. 135, ut cerneres; H. T. 307, ut scires. These last two are 'could' potentials in a result clause. See p. 206 f.

[2] See Durham, Substantive Clauses (Cornell Studies, xiii), p. 109.

e) est (12), e.g. Poen. 1072, si itast ut sis Iahonis filius; Pseud.
1319; Phor. 270, si est culpam ut admiserit; 925, sin est ut velis;
Hec. 99.

f) satin est (= nonne est): Bacch. 491, satin ut nescias.

g) convenit, 'it tallies': Capt. 649, convenit :: ut processerim; cf.
Trin. 429, factum :: ut quidem illud perierit.

h) With nouns or pronouns, used as predicate or appositive (22),
e.g. Merc. 513, nec mos meust ut praedicem; Men. 723; Merc. 629,
de istac re argutus es, ut par pari respondeas; Trin. 637, an id est
sapere ut qui beneficium repudies; Most. 789, antiquom optines hoc
tuom, tardus ut sis; Pers. 46; Aul. 220; Hec. 243, meum ius ut
cogam; 860.

i) With adjectives, etc. (6): Asin. 190, nec meum(st) ut mittam;
Capt. 583, est miserorum ut invideant; Phor. 772, verissume. :: ut
stultissime rem gesserimus; *ut gesserimus* is most naturally taken as
depending on *verum est* to be supplied in thought from *verissume*
(cf. Capt. 649; Trin. 429). Acc. 107; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 50, 7;
Hec. 834.

j) With adverbs. In the two following examples the clause is
apparently substantive and in apposition with the substantive idea
involved in *eo* 'to this': Eun. 690, eo rediges ut nesciam; Phor. 201,
eo meae fortunae redeunt ut distrahar.

k) Elliptical: Pseud. 1109, nec boni ingeni in is est, nisi ut impro-
bis se artibus teneant.

l) In case of the following it is impossible to determine with any
degree of certainty whether we have substantive clauses of result or
substantive clauses developed from the volitive: Amph. 646, id modo
si mercedis datur ut victor clueat; Merc. 1005, non utibilest hic locus
ut arbitri sint; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem?

ADVERBIAL *QUIN*-CLAUSES.

We have already considered several types of clauses introduced
by *quin*, viz. clauses developed from the deliberative; descriptive
quin-clauses; relative clauses of result. Besides these, we have also
certain purely adverbial *quin*-clauses. Thus:

1. We find a number of *quin*-clauses equivalent to 'without' and

a verbal noun; e.g. Asin. 675, numquam orares quin darem, 'you would never ask without my giving.' Expressions of this kind are perhaps ultimately derived from descriptive *quin*-clauses. Thus, M. G. 741, nullus tam in amici hospitium devorti potest, quin, ubi triduom continuom fuerit, odiosus siet, is probably a descriptive clause; 'no one who doesn't become a bore.' But there has developed also the force 'without becoming a bore.' So in many other cases. When this force had become common in sentences of the type cited, it naturally was extended to a wider range, and we find *quin* freely used with the force of 'without,' 'but that,' 'but what,' in combinations where *quin* could not have been originally a relative. In this way a new syntactical construction arose, and *quin* passed from a relative pronoun to a subordinate conjunction.

EXAMPLES: Amph. 308, non feret quin vapulet; 887, neque me perpetiar probri falso insimulatam quin ego illum aut deseram aut satisfaciat; Asin. 421, quoi numquam me licet praecipere quin centiens eadem imperem atque ogganiam; Asin. 675; Aul. 132; 474; Curc. 175; 209; Most. 147; 329; Pseud. 854; Rud. 228; Stich. 187; 754; Trin. 534; Truc. 142; 534; 907; H. T. 67, numquam egredior quin conspicer; 1006; Eun. 791, numquam accedo quin abs te abeam doctior; 841; 1092; Phor. 714; 825; Hec. 397, si id fieri non potest ·quin sentiant; 768; Enn. Trag. 245; Acc. 330; Cato (Jord.), p. 10, 1; Afran. 170; Cornelia, Peter, p. 222, 26.

2. By a further extension of the category just considered, we get a few instances of *quin*-clauses in which *quin* is logically a coördinate conjunction. I refer to sentences like Naev. Trag. 13, numquam hodie effugies quin mea moriaris manu. Originally this undoubtedly was, 'you shall never escape without dying by my hand.' But this is logically absurd. If the person threatened died, he obviously could not escape. The poet has simply used a conventional form of speech, but in a new meaning, the psychology of which is perfectly natural and clear. In this way a new use of *quin* has arisen. Other examples of it are: Amph. 239, nec recedit loco quin statim rem gerat; Asin. 305, nec dependes nec propendes — quin malus nequamque sis; Hec. 64, hortor ne quoiusquam misereat quin spolies, 'not to pity any one but to plunder'; Hec. 150, eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum mihi neque utile virginist; quin integram reddam;

Men. 725. This usage, of course, is well known in the Silver Latinity.

3. The two following seem to be an extension of relative clauses of result; Ad. 855, numquam ita quisquam bene subducta ratione ad vitam fuit quin res aliquid . adportet novi ; 257, numquam ita magnifice quicquam dicam, id virtus quin superet tua.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUOM.*[1]

As a rule in Early Latin, *quom* in all its meanings, temporal, causal, and adversative, is construed with the indicative. Of the exceptions most are the result of attraction (some 50 instances), or are cases of the indefinite 2d singular (27 instances). Apart from these, there are the following examples:

1. *Quom* temporal: Asin. 395, quom venisset, post non redit? (Ussing, *conveni, sed*); Merc. 980, quem quidem, in exsilium quom iret, redduxi ; where *iret* is questioned by Lübbert, and others have suggested *ibat ;* Truc. 162, haud istoc modo solita es me ante appellare, sed blande, quom illuc, quod apud vos nunc est, apud med haberem; where Lübbert would read *habebam ;* Liv. And. 36 (Baehr), quom socios nostros mandisset Ciclops ; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 55, quom Hannibal Italiam lacesseret atque vexaret; p. 64, 1, quom essem in provincia legatus; Pacuv. 166, quom me aspicere dignarent (taken by Koterba, De sermone Pacuviano et Acciano, p. 184, as causal) ; Eun. 22, magistratus quom adesset, occeptast agi ; Afran. 105, intempesta noctu, silices quom findat gelus ; 151, quod praesidium mihi supponebas, quom me privares? 232, ita mater eius dixit, ambos quom emerem ; Enn. Ann. 18, quom superum lumen nox teneret; 327, quomque caput caderet, carmen tuba sola peregit; Lucil. 52, quom vidissent; 904, columnam quom peteret.

2. *Quom* causal: Epid. 111, istoc probior es, quom in amore temperes; where Brix suggests *temperas ;* Men. 361, mihi mira videntur te hic stare foris, fores quoi pateant, magis quam domus tua, quom haec tua sit; M. G. 1287, verum quom acceperim ; where Leo suggests *accepimus ;* Eun. 861, debeam, praesertim quom fa-

---

[1] See especially Lübbert, Die Syntax von Quom, 1870 ; Hale, The Cum-Constructions, 1887, 1888, p. 45, ff. (Cum-Konstruktionen, p. 47 ff.), a trenchant and effective criticism of Lübbert's views ; Dittmar, Studien zur lat. Moduslehre, p. 1 ff.

teatur; Hec. 529, demiror quid sit, praesertim quom recte pepererit;
704, iniussu non tollent meo, praesertim quom sit mi adiutrix socrus;
Ad. 166, indignis quom sim acceptus modis; Gracchus (Meyer), p.
229, quom a servis eorum tam caste me habuerim, poteritis con-
siderare; p. 234, quom ignoraret, rogavit; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201,
quom timerem, Iovem precatus sum.

3. *Quom* adversative: Pseud. 184, pantices madefactatis, quom ego
sim siccus; Enn. Trag. 368, nilo minus ipsi lucet, quom illi accen-
derit; Ann. 119, quom nil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet; Lucil.
651, huc, alio quom iter haberet, venit; Naev. Com. 55, edepol,
Cupido, quom tam pusillus sis, nimis multum vales; where Lübbert
would read *tu tam pausillu's;* Phor. 733, quod ut facerem egestas
me impulit, quom scirem infirmas nuptias hasce esse; Cato, Frag.
(Jord.), p. 19, 9, quom saucius multifariam ibi factus esset, tamen
vulnus capiti nullum evenit.

4. *Quom = si* adversative; Capt. 892, dubium habebis etiam sancte
quom iurem?

For descriptive *quom*-clauses, see p. 292.

The foregoing material shows that even in **Early Latin** the use of
quom temporal, causal, and adversative had already established it-
self. As regards the origin of the usage, I accept the conclusions
of Hale, Cum-Constructions.[1] Hale shows that the *quom*-clause is
simply a form of the clause of characteristic (descriptive clause of
fact). *Quom* is a form of the relative stem *quo-,* and, as such, was
quite as capable of introducing a descriptive clause as was any other
relative word. Just as *qui* took a descriptive clause stating a quality
of a person or thing, so *quom* took a clause stating a quality of a
time, i.e. giving the situation existing at the time. It was in this
way that the use of *quom* temporal developed.

The causal and adversative uses grew out of the temporal use,
purely as a result of the context. Cf. the similar use of English
'when,' e.g. 'When ('since') he saw ruin threatening him, he took
his own life'; 'When ('though') he knew that this step meant ruin
to all his hopes, he nevertheless decided to take it.'

[1] Dittmar's polemic against Hale (op. cit.) does not seem to me at all convincing.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *DUM* TEMPORAL, *DONEC*, *DONICUM*.[1]

1. *Dum*. The use of *dum*, 'until,' with the subjunctive goes back,
I believe, to paratactic optatives in expressions like M. G. 1249,
opperiamur, dum exeat aliquis, 'let us wait; may some one come
out the while' (so Schmalz, Synt.[4], p. 556 f.); Poen. 929, dum erus
adveniat, opperiar, 'may my master arrive the while; I'll wait';
Rud. 328, opperiar erum dum veniat; Truc. 715, praesidebo dum
faciat; Eun. 534, mane dum redeat. *Dum* in these sentences was
the same particle which we recognized in connection with the
clause of proviso, originally the oblique case of a substantive
meaning 'the while.' The bulk of all the subjunctive clauses intro-
duced by *dum*, 'until,' belonging to Early Latin occur after verbs of
awaiting, expecting, watching, etc., thus lending support to the
hypothesis of origin here advanced. Examples:

a) With verbs of awaiting, expecting, etc.: Amph. 696, mane dum
edormiscat; Asin. 935, manere dum cenem; Bacch. 48, dum veniat
opperibere; Men. 883, manendo dum se recipiat; Poen. 785, operam
date dum videatis; Pseud. 1234, nunc ne exspectetis dum domum
redeam; Rud. 922, non exspectare oportet dum erus se suscitet;
Trin. 170, opservavit dum dormitarent canes; Truc. 482, ne exspec-
tetis meas pugnas dum praedicem; 843, nam haud mansisti dum
ego darem illam; And. 977, longum est exspectare dum exeat; 980;
H. T. 543, quid exspectat? an dum hic abeat? Eun. 534, mane dum
redeat; Phor. 89, hic solebamus eam opperiri dum inde iret domum;
480; Ad. 672, an sedere oportuit dum cognatus veniret?

b) With other verbs: Bacch. 932, lubet lamentari dum exeat;
Curc. 525, minas x qui me procurem dum melius sit; M. G. 868,
hunc subcustodem foras ablegavit, dum ab se huc transiret; Pseud.
563, haec facinora promittere, qui vos oblectem, hanc fabulam dum
transigam; Rud. 1189, quid meliust quam ut abeam, saltem tantis-
per dum apscedat haec a me aegrimonia? Trin. 757, dum occasio ei

[1] Elste, De *dum* particulae usu Plautino, 1882; Boettger, De *dum* particulae usu
apud Terentium et in reliquiis trag. et com., 1887; Richardson, De *dum* particulae
apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu, 1886; Lange, De sententiarum temporalium apud
priscos scriptores Latinos syntaxi, 1878; Schmalz, Archiv für lateinische Lexiko-
graphie und Grammatik, xi, p. 333 ff.; Lat. Synt.[4], p. 556; Hale, Anticipatory Sub-
junctive, p. 68 ff.

rei reperiatur, interim ab amico mutuom argentum roges; Truc. 22, non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum sat est amanti, dum id perdiscat; Lucil. 129, nec longius quicquam nobis quam gladium dum accomo- det alter; Cato, Agr. 76, 4, aperito dum inspicias; 95, 1, agitato crebro, usque adeo dum fiat tam crassum quam mel; 107, 2, usque coquito dum dimidium excoquas; 156, 2, paulisper demittito ad modum dum quinque numeres; 160, incipe cantare usque dum coeant (bis). Most of these seem clear cases, though some of them are possibly capable of explanation by attraction or assimilation.

As a rule, only the present tense occurs in *dum*-clauses of this type. Schmalz (Archiv, xi, p. 338) denies the use of *dum*, 'until,' with the imperfect for Early Latin. The above material, however, shows five instances of this idiom.

2. With *donec, donicum*: Rud. 811, ni invitassitis donec nesciat; Cato, Agr. 54, 4, usque dato, donec arescat; uncertain: Com. Incert. Ribb. 74, usque donicum effligatur.

As in the case of the subjunctive introduced by *ante quam* and *prius quam*, so also in the case of subjunctive *dum*-clauses Hale re- fers the employment of the mood to an 'anticipatory' subjunctive; Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, p. 68 ff.; Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, § 507, 5. But this theory seems quite unnecessary, and, in view of the great uncertainty of the presence of an antici- patory at all in Latin, extremely problematic.

SUBJUNCTIVE BY ATTRACTION (ASSIMILATION).

The subjunctive is often employed apparently as the result of attraction or assimilation to another subjunctive or equivalent im- perative. So too when a subordinate clause is so closely connected with an infinitive as to form an integral part of the same, the mood is frequently the subjunctive, and the name "subjunctive by attrac- tion" is given to this use of the subjunctive also.

A. SUBJUNCTIVE ASSIMILATED OR ATTRACTED TO ANOTHER SUB- JUNCTIVE.[1]

In Amer. Jour. Phil. viii, p. 54, Hale says: "In complex sentences made up of a main sentence with subjunctive verb and one or more

[1] Tenney Frank, Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, Chicago, 1904; C. Thulin, De Conjunctivo Latino, Lund, 1899, pp. 79–200; F. Antoine, L'Attraction modale en Latin, Mélanges Boissier, p. 25 ff.

subordinate sentences, the modal feeling in the speaker's mind which
expresses itself in the main sentence is, in the nature of things, very
likely to continue in the speaker's mind in the subordinated sentence
or sentences, either quite unchanged or but slightly shaded. If, for
example, I say in Latin, 'Let him send whom he will,' *mittat quem
velit*, the mood in *velit* is not a case of 'attraction' or 'assimilation'
at all. *Velit* is as much a jussive as *mittat* is. The meaning is,
'Let him choose his man and send that man.' Again, "the frequent
recurrence of such examples gives rise to the occasional use of a
dependent subjunctive with only a formal likeness to the main sub-
junctive, and no true modal feeling."

I am unable to admit the soundness of this reasoning. To my
mind Hale seems to do great violence to the interpretation of the
passage above cited.[1] I do not believe it legitimate to read into
velit the jussive force which Hale attributes to it. Much less can I
admit the justice of Frank's statement (op. cit. p. 4) that Hale's
interpretation of the mood of *velit* is beyond dispute, or that the
modal feeling of the main verb is shared by the dependent subjunc-
tive in sentences like the following (cited by Frank, p. 5): Bacch.
656, furetur quod queat; Hec. 196, di vortant bene quod agas;
Bacch. 673, occasio fuit ut quantum velles tantum sumeres.

I am, therefore, inclined to believe that in the phenomenon under
consideration we are to recognize a purely formal and mechanical
attraction. At least I cannot recognize the validity of the evidence
offered in support of the origin advocated by Hale and Frank.

In a very large number of instances traditionally regarded as
illustrations of attraction, Frank recognizes 'anticipatory' subjunc-
tives (p. 11 ff.). But the existence of an 'anticipatory' subjunctive
in Latin rests on too slender a foundation, in my judgment, to war-
rant its recognition in this type of clause. Especially must one ques-
tion the legitimacy of recognizing an 'anticipatory' subjunctive in
clauses dependent upon another subjunctive until clear instances of
an 'anticipatory' are found following a main clause in the indica-
tive. The passages cited by Frank, p. 13, are not of this kind.
Every present subjunctive naturally contains a future force; but so

[1] Cf. Dittmar's review of Frank, Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift, xxv, col. 919 ff.
Dittmar, however, rejects emphatically the theory of a mechanical attraction.

does every future indicative. The theories of Hale and Frank give no satisfactory explanation of the employment of the subjunctive rather than the future indicative in the subordinate subjunctive clauses in the examples cited in great number by Frank, p. 16 ff. So far as I can see, only the theory of a mechanical attraction will account for the presence of the subjunctive in these clauses.

Classification of Subjunctives Attracted or Assimilated to Another Subjunctive.

The main classification is determined by the nature of the governing clause:

1. Dependent on a jussive or prohibitive (53).

a) With relatives (24), e.g. Bacch. 657, furetur quod queat; Capt. 548, ne tu quod istic fabuletur inmittas; M. G. 190; 731; 1230, quod cupiam ne gravetur; Most. 1100, quod agas id agas; Pseud. 237; Stich. 149, neque me celassis quod scias; Hec. 391; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, reliqua quae sint, uti conpareant; quae opus sint locato, locentur; quae supersint, uti veneant; Plaut. Frag. 88, quique liceat veneat.

b) With *si, sin* (16): Amph. 819, si pudoris egeas, sumas mutuom; 961, tristis sit, si sint tristes; hilaris sit, si gaudeant; Asin. 763, si pictura sit, vendat; Aul. 591, sin dormitet, ita dormitet; M. G. 188; 293, si te di ament, tollas; Rud. 834, abeas, si velis; Trin. 370, ne prohibeas, si det; Truc. 233; 839; 855; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, si quid desit, uti paretur; 2, 7; 5, 1.

c) With *ubi* (5): Bacch. 653, ubiquomque usus siet, expromat; Pers. 70; Truc. 230, ubi nil det, mittat domum; 232; Cato, Agr. 3, 2, ubi lecta siet, oleum fiat.

d) With other particles: *dum* (2): Poen. 20, neu ducat, dum in scaena siet; Truc. 232, dum habeat tum (Lamb. conj. *dum*) amet; *quom:* Pers. 152, ut adfleat, quom memoret; *quando:* Pseud. 307, quando nil sit, amare desinat; *quam:* Hec. 634, dum ne redducam, turbent porro quam velint; *ut :* Amph. 960, eri ut sint, ipse item sit; Bacch. 662, utquomque res sit, ita animum habeat.

2. Dependent on a deliberative (25).

a) With relatives (14): Amph. 434, quid ego ni negem, qui egomet siem ? 694, te ut deludam, qui nunc primum te advenisse dicas, modo qui hinc abieris; Bacch. 197, egon ut, quod attigisset, non impetra-

tum redderem? M. G. 426; 497; 556; 1276; Poen. 860; Hec. 852; Enn. Trag. 148.

b) With *quom* (7): Bacch. 1192, egon quom haec accubet inspectem? And. 943, egon patiar quom possim? H. T. 413; Eun. 565; Hec. 341; Enn. Trag. 121; Titin. 81.

c) With *ubi* (4): Bacch. 1190, egon ubi filius corrumpatur meus, ibi potem? Epid. 588; Men. 559; Phor. 970.

3. Dependent on an optative subjunctive (14): Asin. 46, di tibi dent quaequomque optes; similarly Epid. 6; M. G. 1038; Pers. 483; Poen. 1055; Stich. 469; Trin. 715, bene quod agas eveniat; Phor. 552; Pseud. 936, tantum duint quantum exoptes; Poen. 746, suspendant se quam quod loquantur creduam.

4. Dependent on a potential (16).

a) With relatives (10): Amph. 905, quam tu impudicam esse arbitrere et praedices, cum ea sermonem nec habeas; Capt. 961, quod ego fatear, credin pudeat? Curc. 700, quoquo posset, mitteret; M. G. 614; 735; Poen. 92.

b) With *ubi* (4): Men. 603, intro abeam, ubi bene sit; Poen. 148; Eun. 1080, facile pellas, ubi velis.

c) With other particles: *quom:* Capt. 961, credin pudeat, quom autumes? Rud. 979; *dum:* Rud. 1261, dum censeret, praeda esset; *ad quo:* Afran. 248, iratus essem ad quo (= in quantum, Nonius) liceret.

5. Dependent on purpose clauses (84).

a) With relatives (23): Aul. 605, ut quae fierent fieret particeps; Cas. 867, qui exeat, eum ut ludibrio habeas; Cist. 85; Curc. 29, ne id quod ames sit probro; Eun. 1026, ut faciam quod iubeat; Hec. 545.

b) With *quom* (22): Amph. 128, ut ne quaererent quom viderent me; 983, ut ministres mihi, mihi quom sacruficem; Asin. 185, se ut quom videat, gaudeat; Aul. 278; Bacch. 908; Most. 249; Pers. 190; 191; And. 424; H. T. 854; Phor. 839; Cato, Agr. 73.

c) With *si* (24): Amph. 724, ut quod obrodat sit, si male esse occeperit; Cist. 593, ne in quaestione sit, si quid velim; Curc. 468; Merc. 231, neu discordarent, si essent; 913; Most. 922; Poen. 27; Pseud. 93; 900; Trin. 691; 755; And. 316; 728; Phor. 314; Ad. 171; 282; Enn. Ann. 194, 8. In all these cases, of course, it is

entirely possible that there is no attraction, but that the *si*-clause represents an original 'should'-'would' condition.

d) With *ubi* (5): M. G. 3, ut, ubi usus veniat, praestringat; 1122; Pers. 230, ne, ubi vorsicapillus fias, servias; Pseud. 580, ut, ubiquomque congrediar, vincam.

e) With *quando* (5); Bacch. 730, ut cognoscat quando legat; 768; Men. 1045; Poen. 552; Trin. 1144.

f) With *dum* (5): Curc. 664, ut dum vivat alat; M. G. 950; Phor. 770; 1030; Trag. Incert. 169.

g) With other particles (5): *quam primum:* Trin. 42, ut, quam primum possim, videam; *etsi:* Vid. xiii, ut piscetur, etsi sit tempestas; *ut:* Capt. 343, qui ita ut velis perferat; *priusquam:* Truc. 524, ne, prius quam capiat, nos exstinxit fames. *quia:* M. G. 7, ne lamentur quia se iam pridem feriatam gestitem.

6. Dependent on a substantive clause developed from the volitive or optative (93).

a) With relatives (43): Amph. 60, facere ut sit comoedia reges quo veniant; 630, sum diligens ut quae imperes compareant; Bacch. 1173, non metuo ne quid doleat quod ferias; Capt. 257, causa ut vos servem quos sim mercatus; Curc. 550, mandasti qui attulissem ne spernerem; Poen. 6, iubet ut sedeant qui venerint; Phor. 125, lex est ut orbae qui sint proximi nubant; Stat. 162; Cato, Agr. 141, 1.

b) With *si, nisi,* etc. (19): Bacch. 778, adiuro ut, ni amem atque cupiam, tua latera lacerentur; 1037; M. G. 1187; Rud. 1295; And. 687, orare, si ames, ut venias.

c) With *quom* (9): Amph. 542, volo, ut quom absim, me ames; Aul. 273; Epid. 356; Capt. 495; Stich. 65; H. T. 1017, metuis ne non, quom velis, convincas; Cato, Agr. 28, 1.

d) With *ubi* (6): Bacch. 43, ut, ubi emeritum sit, se revehat; 45; M. G. 1234, ne mutent ubi viderit; Eun. 394; CIL. i, 196, censuit utei figier ioubeatis ubi facilumed gnoscier potisit.

e) With *dum* (7): Bacch. 1047, Ephesi multo mavellem foret, dum salvos esset; Pers. 494; Poen. 884; Rud. 499, quaeso, dum vivas, uti habeas; Ad. 681.

f) With *quando:* Truc. 432, ut, quando otium sit, ad me revisas; Pseud. 663; M. G. Arg. I, 11.

g) With *quam* (3): Most. 966, vide ne amplius quam satis fuerit biberis; Eun..74; Hec. 729.

h) With other particles (3): *etsi:* Capt. 856, faciam ut cupias etsi votem; *utquomque:* And. 735, ut subservias utquomque opus sit, vide; *prius quam:* Eun. 751, cave ne, prius quam accipias, amittas.

7. Dependent on *quin*-clauses (mostly substantive) (11).

a) With relatives (6): M. G. 369, numquam deterrebor quin viderim quod viderim; Poen. 881; Trin. 588; Phor. 272.

b) With *ubi :* M. G. 742, quin, ubi triduom fuerit, odiosus siet, verum ubi dies x sit; Aul. 613.

c) With *si:* Capt. 353, numquae causast quin, si non redeat, des; Phor. 825, quin, si hoc celetur, in metu; sin patefit (note the indicative), in probro sim.

d) With *quom:* M. G. 1342, nequeo quin fleam quom abeam.

8. Dependent on a descriptive clause of fact ('clause of characteristic') (14).

a) With relatives (10) : Capt. 467, dies quoi minus procedat quicquid facere occeperit; Cas. 183, nec qua in plura sint quae velim; 565; Trin. 953.

b) With *ubi:* Rud. 119, qui praefestinet, ubi erus adsit, praeloqui; Hec. 608, qui, ubiquomque opus sit, possit.

c) With *quom:* Cas. 133, unde auscultare possis, quom ausculer.

9. Dependent on result clauses (21).

a) With relatives (7): Merc. 513, mos est ut praedicem quod credam; Most. 173.

b) With *quom* (6): Trin. 732, ut perpetiar quom habeam; Eun. 933, ut, quom cognorit, oderit; Phor. 822.

c) With *si* (4): Curc. 379, hunc morem ut pugnis rem solvant si quis poscat; M. G. 475, quid propius fuit quam ut perirem, si elocutus essem ? Hec. 548.

d) With other particles: *ubi:* Phor. 154, ut extimescam, ubi in mentem veniat; *quam:* Rud. 1242, ut cum maiore dote abeat quam advenerit; *dum:* H. T. 951, ut, dum vivat, meminerit.

10. Dependent on a subjunctive protasis (13).

a) With relatives (9): Amph. 871, mea sit culpa, quod egomet contraxerim, si id Alcumenae expetat; Capt. 205, si sinat solutos quos emerit; Curc. 268; Pseud. 785.

b) With other particles: *quom* (2): Men. 454, nisi adsint quom citentur; Truc. 234; *quando:* Merc. 406, si sequatur, quando incedat; *dum:* Bacch. 1194, si, dum vivas, tibi bene facias.

11. Dependent on indirect questions (16).

a) With relatives (12): Amph. 1016, quis fuerit quem propter corpus stupri compleverit; Trin. 210, falson an vero laudent quem velint; Vid. 57; H. T. 1040.

b) With *quom:* Merc. 344, neque, quom roget, quid loquar cogitatumst.

c) With *si:* Rud. 925, ut piger, si velim, siem; Merc. 941.

12. Dependent on a 'stipulative' subjunctive (see p. 263) (7): Amph. 225, convenit, victi utri sint, urbem uti dederent; Capt. 380; Rud. 1128, concredam; ac si nil sit, ut reddas; Poen. 855; And. 200; Epid. 500.

13. Dependent on a clause of proviso (4): Trin. 211, dum quod lubeat sciant; CIL, i, 196 (ter).

14. Dependent on a causal clause: Cist. 102, iratast quia non redierim postquam resciverim.

15. Dependent on an imperative or future indicative: Amph. 439, ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto Sosia; Asin. 29, dic, obsecro hercle, serio quod te rogem; CIL, xi, 4766, neque efferto quod louci siet; Pers. 16, dabunt di quae exoptes; Asin. 623, dabunt di quae velitis; Cato, Agr. 29, in segetem, ubi pabulum seras, invehito. In all these the main verb is equivalent to a volitive or optative subjunctive. Attraction to the subjunctive after an imperative is found in Umbrian also, e.g. pone esonome ferar, ere fertu poe . . ., 'when it is carried, let him carry it, who,' etc.

16. Miscellaneous: Asin. 122, moriri mavolet quam non reddat quod promiserit; Men. 229, maior quasi terram videas (indefinite 2d singular), quae fuerit tua; Trin. 549, sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas, quo cuncti qui aetatem egerint caste suam conveniant. Here the clause governing the attracted clause is a clause in implied indirect discourse.

As regards the conditions under which attraction takes place, Frank's study shows:

1. The attracted clause is preferably in the same time-sphere as the clause on which it depends.

2. Its favorite position is between the introductory conjunction (when such exists) and the verb of the governing clause.

3. Its verb rarely expresses precise modal and temporal force.

4. The clause as a whole is rather of the generalizing than of the determinative type.

5. It is more frequently a temporal than a relative clause.

6. It is connected with the predicate more frequently than with the subject or object of the sentence.

7. As a rule, it is an essential clause, and grammatically depends very closely upon the main body of the clause to which it is attracted.

These favoring conditions are met in only about 37 % of all the clauses dependent upon subjunctives. When these favoring conditions do not exist, the dependent clause stands in the indicative, unless the clause would regularly stand in the subjunctive for some other reason (purpose, result, *etc.*).

B. Subjunctive by Attraction in Clauses Dependent on an Infinitive.[1]

That the infinitive, even outside of the limits of indirect discourse, has the power of causing the employment of the subjunctive in dependent clauses which would otherwise take the indicative, is sufficiently familiar. The name ' subjunctive by attraction ' is given to this usage precisely as when a subjunctive is attracted to another subjunctive.

The origin of the usage is not easy to account for satisfactorily. However, I am strongly persuaded that Frank has discovered the truth, when (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxv, p. 428 ff.) he holds that the ' attraction ' of the mood after the infinitive began with those infinitives which were logically equivalent to subjunctives. Thus when Plautus, Amph. 705, says, certa res hanc est obiurigare quae me noluerit salutare, this is felt as equivalent to *certa res est ut hanc obiurigem*, etc., and the subjunctive *noluerit* is in consequence used after *obiurigare*, just as it would have been after *obiurigem*. So Bacch. 58, apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo, where *te esse* is felt as the equivalent of *sis* or *ut sis*. A very large number (70 %) of all the

[1] Frank, The Influence of the Infinitive upon Verbs Subordinated to it, Amer. Jour. Phil. xxv, p. 428 ff.; Thulin, De Conjunctivo Latino, Lund. 1899, pp. 1–76.

instances of 'subjunctive by attraction' after infinitives in Early
Latin occur after infinitives of this type, viz. infinitives equivalent
to subjunctives. I give the material in full (61 instances).

1. With relatives (34): Asin. 24, video necesse esse eloqui quid-
quid roges; Aul. 129; 751, si facere quod lubeat licet; Capt. 363,
volt te operam dare quod is velit; Cas. 570, qui advocatos advocet,
rogitare oportet; 872; M. G. 182, iube transire huc quantum possit;
982; Pers. 273; 601; Poen. 966, pati servire domi quae fuerint
liberae; Pseud. 460, decet innocentem qui sit superbum esse; 1150;
Rud. 112; 272; 321; 117; 394; Stich. 69; 686; Trin. 1105, iubeto
quae imperaverim curare; Truc. 225; 228; Plaut. Frag. 80, agere
oportet quod agas; And. 219, quicquid peperisset decreverunt tollere;
464, quod peperisset iussit tolli; H. T. 165, non convenit qui ad
laborem pepulerim nunc me ipsum fugere; Phor. 537; Hec. 244, ut
te cogam quae imperem facere; 840; Cato, Agr. 135, 3; CIL, i,
196, 1, de Bacanalibus quei foideratei esent ita exdeicendum esse
censuere; i, 5041, oppidum quod posedisent possidere iousit dum
poplus Romanus vellet; Stat. 183.

2. With *quom* (6): Bacch. 58, apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo;
76, quom adveniat, te volo me amplexari; Capt. 146, alienus quom
tam aegre feras, quid me patrem par facere est? Phor. 202, istaec
quom ita sint, tanto magis te advigilare aequomst; 928; Scaurus
(Meyer), p. 242, est iniquom, quom inter alios vixerim, apud alios
me rationem vitae reddere.

3. With *si, ni,* etc. (15): Amph. 69, sive qui ambissent palmam,
sive quoi duint, sirempse legem iussit esse; 880; 986, qui minus
liceat minitari populo ni decedat mihi? Bacch. 1045; Cas. 440;
Men. 848, votas parcere ni abscedat; M. G. 1356; Stich. 563; H. T.
626, mihi te edicere, si parerem, nolle tolli; Cato, Agr. 3, 5, esse
oportet si contriti sint; 151, 4; Frag. (Jord.) p. 64, 4; CIL, i, 197,
10, iubeto eum, si pariat (= pareat) condemnari; 196, 24, si ques
essent qui fecisent, eis rem caputalem faciendam censuere; 6, (exdei-
cendum censuere) si ques esent qui deicerent.

4. With other particles (6): *quam:* Pseud. 439, qui gnatum suom
esse probiorem quam ipsus fuerit postulet; Trin. 175; *ubi:* Cato,
Agr. 2, 5, (oportet) ubi ea cognita sint, curare ut perficiantur; 155,
2; *ut:* Trin. 306, utrum esse mavelit ut animus censeat an ita ut

cognati velint; CIL, i, 199, 4, ubi ea facta essent, Romam venire
iusserunt.

We have seen that the main source of the construction is quite
probably to be sought in the use of the infinitive as the equivalent
of the subjunctive. A contributory cause, recognized by Frank, is to
be found in those cases where the attracting infinitive itself depends
upon a subjunctive (9 instances). Thus in Cist. 497, quodcumque
optes tibi velim contingere, it is entirely natural that *optes* should
be attracted by *velim*. Other similar passages are: Pers. 290, liceat
quom servos sis, dicere; Poen. 681, videre vos vellem quom aurum
darem; Hec. 532, ut puerum praeoptares perire ex quo fore amicitiam
scires; Com. Incert. (Ribb. p. 137), artem ne pudeat proloqui quam
factites; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, qui vendiderint eos pigeat vendidisse; 2, 1,
possitne, quae reliqua sint, conficere; Lucil. 145, 4, ut perisse velis
quem visere nolueris. Under the same head I should bring CIL,
xi, 4766, eod die quod reidinae causa fiat sine dolo cedere licetod,
where the imperative is equivalent to a jussive subjunctive.

It will be noted that in most of the foregoing passages the attract-
ing subjunctive is in close proximity — much closer than the infinitive
— to the attracted subjunctive.

The preceding 70 examples include all but 16 of the cases of
'attraction' after the infinitive. The remainder, I believe, are to
be accounted for as influenced by the two preceding types. Exam-
ples: Amph. 39, debetis velle quae velimus; Capt. 986, mos est
oblivisci neque novisse quoius nihili sit faciunda gratia; Cas. 564,
stultitia est ad forum procedere in eum diem quoi quod amet in
mundo siet; Men. 1004, facinus indignum, erum deripier qui liber
venerit; Trin. 357; Phor. 79; 960, quod auditura sit indicare pla-
cabilius est; Hec. 73; 149, quam decrerim me non posse diutius
habere eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum est; Acc. 193; 215;
Ad. 341, quom amet aliam, non est utile hanc dari; H. T. 578,
nostrumst intellegere utquomque opus sit; Phor. 502, quom occu-
patus esset, hoc esse obiectum malum! Ad. 39, instituere parare
quod sit carius. In the last two examples the infinitive is exclama-
tory, the only instances in Early Latin of the exclamatory infinitive
with attracted subjunctive.

Frank in his discussion does not mention Ad. 39; while in the

Phormio passage he suggests that the *quom*-clause may be an early instance of *quom* causal.

Of the historical infinitive with attracted subjunctive, no instance appears in Early Latin.

On the whole the subjunctive is less frequent than the indicative in dependence upon those infinitives with which the subjunctive is possible. For the instances in Early Latin, see Frank, p. 443 f. The subjunctive was never obligatory, and was used only where the subordinate clause was an integral part of the idea conveyed by the infinitive. Furthermore it is usually generalizing and unemphatic, rather than determinative and emphatic. If relative, it is usually attached to the object of the infinitive; see Frank, p. 444 f.

Some of the examples cited as illustrating our construction, Frank (l. c. p. 430) regards as specimens of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse, e.g. passages like M. G. 182, iube transire huc quantum possit. While there seems to be no doubt of the close relationship of such a sentence as this to indirect discourse, yet it seems to me safer to regard this and similar examples as furnishing the starting-point of indirect discourse, rather than as influenced by it. See below under " Subjunctive in Oratio Obliqua."

SUBJUNCTIVE IN ORATIO OBLIQUA.

In my discussion of the subjunctive by attraction (see above, p. 312), I explained the " subjunctive by attraction " after the infinitive as resulting from the equivalence of the infinitive to certain common types of dependent subjunctives. The subjunctive in oratio obliqua seems to be an extension of the "subjunctive by attraction."[1] Expressions like Capt. 362, volt te operam dare quod velit; M. G. 182, iube transire huc quantum possit; Bacch. 58, apud me te esse, quom veniat, volo; Men. 848, votas parcere ni abscedat; CIL, i, 197, 10, iubeto eum, sei pariat (pareat), condemnari, are frequent in Early Latin, and, I believe, are correctly explained as the result of assimilation. On the basis of such expressions as those just cited, it was an easy step to such as the following: Asin. 363, interminatust nos

[1] The suggestion of Schlicher (Amer. Jour. Phil. xxvi, p. 71 ff.) that the usage under discussion is an extension of the repudiating subjunctive as expressing the status of an idea foreign to the speaker, is vague and far from convincing.

futuros ulmeos ni hodie essent xx minae; Pseud. 777, interminatus
est, si non munus misisset, eum perbitere; And. 694, adiuro num-
quam me deserturum, non si sciam; Cas. 670, deieravit occisurum eum
quicum cubaret; Rud. 1336, deiera te daturum eodem die ubi sis
potitus; M. G. 1414, iuro me nociturum nemini quod vapularim; Rud.
1378, si redegissem, iuratust dare; Bacch. 1028, ius iurandum dedi
daturum id priusquam abiret; Aul. 470, credo mercedem pollicitos
si fecisset; Most. 1084, pollicitus dare si vellem; Asin. 529, pro-
mittat te facturum divitem si moriatur mater; Curc. 490, promisisse,
si quisquam adsereret, redditum iri; 667, promisit, si asseruisset,
reddere; 709, promistin, si assereret, te redditurum; Cas. 53, sperat,
si sit data, fore; Turpil. 58, sperabam, quom aetas accesset, non
fore.

Expressions like the foregoing seem to me to have furnished the
beginnings of the use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses of
indirect discourse. They stand on the border-line between the sub-
junctive by attraction after the infinitive, on the one hand, and the
regular subjunctive in subordinate clauses after *verba sentiendi et de-
clarandi*, on the other. They are related to the subjunctive by
attraction after the infinitive in that the governing verb is related
in meaning to those verbs which are followed by an infinitive and
an attracted subjunctive. Thus we have verbs of threatening,
vowing, promising, hoping, after the analogy of verbs of ordering,
forbidding, wishing, and the like. Another point of likeness is that
these verbs look forward to the future, like those after which we
have the infinitive and the attracted subjunctive. At the same time
we have in the expressions last cited genuine examples of oratio
obliqua.

In thorough conformity with the theory that the beginning of the
usage under discussion is to be sought in such expressions as I have
cited, is the fact that in Early Latin a very large proportion (40 out
of 100) of all occurrences of subordinate clauses in indirect discourse
is found in sentences in which the reference of the dependent infini-
tive is to the future. Thus: Pseud. 1118, leno ubi esset domi me
aiebat arcessere; Lucil. 639, habeas in animo causam gravem fore
quae me abducat; Trin. 695, te dictatorem censes fore, si acceperim;
Truc. 90, censuit celare se posse, gravida si foret; Trin. 1086, credidi

aegre tibi, ubi audisses fore; Amph. 207; 209; Bacch. 700; Merc. 419; 83; Rud. 405; Cas. 323; etc.

Examples (classified according to the introductory word):

a) Introduced by a relative pronoun (31): Cist. 585, se aibat mulierem convenire quacum esset negotium; Curc. 488; Trin. 212; Bacch. 953; M. G. 1391; Phor. 246, quicquid eveniat id deputare in lucro; Bacch. 344, haud utrum velim licere intellego.

b) Introduced by a conditional particle (38): Amph. 675, me meum officium facere, si eam, arbitror; Merc. 83, dico iturum me, si velit; Rud. 405, si peterem daturos dixit; Trin. 891, dicas, si quid crediderim, perisse; Stich. 80; H. T. 608; Cas. 323; 698, negat ponere nisi sciat; Merc. 243, respondet, ni properem, ducturum; And. 647, nonne sat esse visum est, ni lactasses et produceres; Phor. 643, quantum? :: si quis daret (sc. contentum fore).

c) Introduced by *quom* (8): Asin. 442, aibat reddere quom redditum esset; Merc. 70, sese laboravisse quom pater diceret; M. G. 389, arguere me visus est quom mea soror osculata esset; Rud. 1124; And. 330; Ad. 34; Lucil. 546; Cato, Jord., p. 46, 1.

d) Introduced by *ubi* (3): Pseud. 597, (dixit) septumas esse aedis ubi ille habitet; Pseud. 1118; Trin. 1086.

e) Introduced by *postquam* (5): Merc. 61, se postquam excesserit non dedisse; 73; Most. 975.

f) Introduced by *ante quam* and *prius quam* (5): M. G. 885, multos vidi fugere prius quam haberent; Bacch. 1030; H. T. 479; 816; Hec. 146.

g) Introduced by *dum* (4): Truc. 440, ostendit se infidelem numquam dum vivat fore; Merc. 77; H. T. 148.

h) Other particles: Poen. 276, qui mage inmortalis vos credam esse quam ego siem? Trin. 742, neque ut sit data te sistere autument; Asin. 913; Merc. 67, ut spectavisset, solitum (esse); Cas. 420, scin rus hinc esse longe quo ducat? Phor. 722, quantum voluerit datum esse; Epid. 415, facturum dixit rem esse divinam domi, quia salvos redierit; M. G. 1031, lamentari ait illam quia tis egeat; 1414, iuro me nociturum nemini quod vapularim; Most. 520, illum credidi expostulare quia percussisses fores; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 5, ecquis est qui aequom censeat poenas dare ob eam rem quod arguatur male facere voluisse?

For the list of verbs followed by oratio obliqua, see under the Infinitive.

Implied Indirect Discourse.

Under this head belong the following: Hec. 651, hunc videre optabamus diem quom ex te esset aliquis; Capt. 998, vidi saepe picta quae Acherunti fierent; Men. 144, tabulam pictam ubi aquila Catameitum raperet; Pseud. 624, argento haec dies praestitutast quoad referret; Trin. 549, sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas quo cuncti conveniant; Eun. 1013, paenitebat ni indicares; Pseud. 1242, quas promisi si effecisset; Acc. 325, primores provocavit si esset quis qui secum vellet cernere.

Subjunctive in Principal Clauses in Oratio Obliqua.[1]

Of this usage, which becomes common in late Latin, we have, I believe, an instance in Asin. 52, scio quod amet. The attempt of Blass (Rhein. Mus. 1882, p. 151 f.) to explain *quod amet* as depending on the previous *suscenseam* cannot be regarded as successful. Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 77, 1, dicam de istis Graecis suo loco quid Athenis exquisitum habeam et quod bonum sit illorum litteras inspicere non perdiscere, is taken by Mayen, op. cit., p. 10, as another instance of the same construction, dependent upon the following *vincam.* But it is impossible to dissociate *vincam* from the succeeding *esse.* It seems simplest to adopt Jordan's conjecture *quor.*

SUBJUNCTIVE CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY *QUOD, QUIA, QUO*, ETC.[2]

The traditional explanation of the mood in these clauses represents them as a kind of indirect discourse. This view seems reasonably borne out by the following material in Early Latin.

1. **With *quod*.** Examples are scanty. I have noted only Asin. 47, cur miniter tibi propterea quod me non scientem feceris? 582, hospitem inclamavit quod noluisset; Merc. 573, pervorse facis. : : quodne amem? (Scaliger's conjecture for *ames* of the MSS); Trag. Incert. (Ribb.) 123, rite Thesprotum pudet Atrei quod ipse a Tantalo ducat genus (Bothe *ductat;* Keil *ducit*); Afran. 165, retinebitur vir

---

[1] See Mayen, De particulis *quod, quia,* etc. pro acc. cum infin., 1889, p. 7 ff.
[2] Zimmermann, Gebrauch der Konjunktionem *quod* und *quia* im älteren Latein.

praegnatem quod non exigat; Stich. Arg. 1, senex castigat filias quod eae viros tam perseverent sustinere.

2. **With *quia*:** Cas. 677, tibi infesta est. : : quam ob rem ? : : quia se des Olympioni; M. G. 387, laeta visa (sum) quia venisset; Rud. 537, iure optimo me † lavisse † arbitror. : : qui ? : : quia (*qui* A) auderem tecum in navem ascendere; Pacuv. 369, insanam esse aiunt quia incerta sit; caecam esse iterant, quia nil cernat; brutam quia nequeat internoscere; Bacch. 735, me loquitur nec recte quia reddidi et quia non fraudaverim; M. G. 1035, me inclamato quia te volgem; 860, excruciabit me quia non dixerim; Cist. 101, iratast quia non redierim; Merc. 924, iratast quia scortum adduxerit; M. G. 696, quia nil abstulerit suscenset; And. 376, si suscenseat quia non det; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 13, 6, quia is locus montibus praestet, Praeneste oppido nomen dedit; Calp. Piso (Peter), 82, 9, Tarquinium, quia Tarquinio nomine esset, metuere (hist. infin.).

The *quia*-clause is at times the apodosis (in the potential subjunctive) of a conditional sentence with suppressed protasis, e.g. Capt. 705, cur es ausus mentiri ? : : quia vera obessent illi; Most. 1107, quia nil illi quaesti siet; Pseud. 318, cur non ? : : quia pol qua opera credam tibi, una opera alligem canem agninis lactibus; 338.

3. **With *non quo, quam quo, non quod, non quia, quin* :** H. T. 554, neque eo dico quo quicquam senserim; Eun. 96, non quo quemquam plus amem aut plus diligam, eo feci; Amph. 913, non quo crederem; Ad. 825, non quo dissimilis res sit; 270, adsentandi magis quam quo habeam; And. Alter Ex. 7, non idcirco quod nollem; Asin. 844, non eo quia cupiam; Trin. 341, non eo haec dico quin velim.

Non quo is usually explained as for *non eo quod* by attraction; cf. *neque eo quo* in H. T. 554.

SUBJUNCTIVE OF INDEFINITE SECOND SINGULAR IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES.

As a rule all subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular stand in the subjunctive. Exceptions occur, e.g. Capt. 89, nisi qui colaphos perpeti potes (Cam. *potis*); Men. 87, quem adservare recte voles, esca vinciri decet; 93, facile adservabis dum eo vinclo vincies;[1] Merc. 146, quom uti voles (following a subjunctive); Truc.

---

[1] But in 95 we have the subjunctive.

768, si stimulos pugnis caedis, manibus plus dolet; Cato, Agr. 3, 3, si sustuleris et parata erunt; 157, 16, auribus si parum audies; 158, 1, si vis;[1] Asin. 242, si adfers, tum patent; Appius Claudius (Baehrens, Frag. 2), amicum quom vides, obliviscere miserias.

In Wölfflin's Archiv für Lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik, ix, p. 19 f., Blase has denied that the subjunctive is regularly employed in subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular.[2] But barring Cato and a mere handful of examples, of which those above cited are the chief, if not all, the subjunctive is always used in clauses of this type in Early Latin. Probably the same is true also for the classical language, though I have not accurate data for this period.

The origin of the usage under discussion is obscure. Possibly it is to be sought in expressions like the following: Amph. 705, si obsequare, una resolvas plaga; Cas. 562, quom aspicias tristem, frugi censeas; Pseud. 137, quos quom ferias, tibi plus noceas; Trin. 496, ubi mortuos sis, ita sis ut nomen cluet; 1052, quom repetas, inimicum amicum invenias beneficio tuo; Phor. 265, unum quom noris, omnis noris; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; etc. In these the subjunctive in the main clause is the weakened potential discussed at p. 200 f. In the dependent clause the subjunctive is naturally explained as due to attraction. Expressions of the type cited are proverbial in character, and must have been very frequent in daily use. It is possible that the regular use of the subjunctive in subordinate clauses in the indefinite 2d singular may be an extension of its employment in these proverbial expressions.

Examples:

a) In conditional sentences (35): Amph. 703, si velis advorsarier, 705; Aul. 380, si quid prodegeris, egere liceat nisi peperceris; Capt. 202, animo si bono utare, adiuvat; 222; Men. 103; Poen. 213, si forte occeperis; Trin. 347; And. 637; Phor. 688; Ad. 28; Cato, Agr. 37, 1, si cariosam terram tractes; 95, 2; Frag. (Jord.), p. 83, 5; si exerceas; si non exerceas; si nihil exerceas.

b) With relative pronouns (24): M. G. 675, quod sumas; 947; Most. 73, quod cupide petas; 782, quicquid imponas vehunt; Pers.

---

[1] In Cato the indicative is the regular mood in these clauses; the subjunctive is rare. Frank (Attraction of Mood in Early Latin, p. 16, footnote) regards the de Agr. as addressed to a definite person, but that is inconsistent with the occasional occurrence of expressions like 95, 2, si in tecto coquas, excandescet.

[2] Similarly Hoffmann, Modus in Lateinischen Zeitsatze, p. 27 ff.

114, mane quod occeperis; H. T. 570, animum advortunt quae non censeas; Eun. 761; Phor. 758; Lucil. 783, quantum habeas tantum ipse sies tantique habearis; Cato, Agr. 37, 3, palos quos in tecto posueris; 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

c) With *quom* (27): Bacch. 540, quom censeas esse amicos, reperiuntur falsi; Cas. 562, quom adspicias; Epid. 624, quom adspexeris; 718, quom mali messim metas; M. G. 820, quom stertas; 1150, quom escenderis; And. 856, quom videas; H. T. 806; Eun. 659; Phor. 265, unum quom noris, omnis noris; *quom noris* is the reading of A. Donat. read *cognoris;* Cato, Agr. 61, 1, quom ares, bene ares; Frag. (Jord.), 28, 8, ventus quom loquare buccam implet.

d) With *ubi* (21): Bacch. 63, ubi periclum facias, aculeata sunt.; Cas. 370, ita fit, ubi quid tanto opere expetas; Cist. 25; Merc. 839; Pers. 435, ubi quid credideris; H. T. 1059, ubi cognoris; Eun. 813.

e) With *quando* (3): Aul. 506, quando veneris; Merc. 118, tres res agendae sunt, quando unam acceperis; Ad. 206.

f) With *quam* (4): Men. 95, quam magis extendas, tanto astringunt artius; Pseud. 1175, quam velis, pernix homost (P *quamvis*); Trin. 530; Aul. 236, quam ad probos propinquitate proxume te adiunxeris, tam optumumst.

g) With *prius quam* and *ante quam* (3): Truc. 51, prius quam dederis; Ad. 583, prius quam ad portam venias, apud lacum est pistrilla; Cato, capit. 143.

h) With *ut* and *quasi* (= *sicut*) (3): And. 65, ita ut facillume laudem invenias et amicos pares; Pseud. 578, omnes res perinde sunt ut agas; H. T. 1058.

i) With *dum* (3): Men. 90, dum praebeas; Pseud. 629, dum sternuas, res erit soluta; Acc. 395.

j) With other particles (4): Trin. 679, datur tametsi petas; Aul. 505, quoquo venias, plus plaustrorum videas; And. Alt. Ex. 16, quocumque adplicaveris; Men. 228, maior (voluptas) quasi ('than if') adveniens terram videas quae fuerit tua.

SUBJUNCTIVE CLAUSES WITH *QUAM,* INCLUDING *ANTE QUAM, POTIUS QUAM, PRIUS QUAM.*

Quam, Potius Quam.

Quam is a coördinate conjunction and as such is properly followed by the same construction after it as before it. Hence where a subjunctive precedes, it is only natural that one should follow. Thus:

1. Independent subjunctives.

a) Jussives: Asin. 797, tu labellum abstergeas potius quam savium faciat; Pseud. 237, praevortaris quam animo auscultes; Rud. 1042, fiat potius quam pugnem; Ad. 248, potius quam litis sequar meum mihi reddatur.

b) Optatives: Aul. 50, me adaxint ad suspendium potius quam serviam; Poen. 746, suspendant se quam creduam.

c) Potentials: Bacch. 488, plus viderem quam deceret; 1040, dem potius aurum quam illum corrumpi sinam; Hec. 424, aufugerim potius quam redeam; Ad. 108, sineres potius quam faceret.

2. Dependent subjunctives.

a) Purpose clauses: Cas. 254, ut detur potius quam des; Men. 332, ut te abducat potius quam adstes foris; And. 162, magis id adeo mihi ut incommodet quam ut obsequatur gnato.

b) Substantive clauses: Bacch. 103, operam dabo ut accipias potius quam eas; Bacch. 1047, Ephesi mavellem foret quam revenisset; Cas. 252, iam domuisti animum potius ut quod vir velit facias quam advorsere? Men. 725, non patiar quin vidua vivam quam perferam; Merc. 486, visne eam ? : : qui (sc. volo eas) potius quam voles? Most. 706, exsequi certa rest ut abeam potius quam domi cubem; Poen. 1150, facias quam memores mavelim; Pseud. 209, taceas malo quam tacere dicas; H. T. 928, abeat potius malo quam ad inopiam redigat patrem.

c) Descriptive clauses: Trin. 1057, ego sum insipientior qui curem potius quam tutelam geram.

d) Result clauses: Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire potius quam esset nupta!

e) After infinitives. After the analogy of expressions like *taceas*

malo quam tacere dicas (Pseud. 209), it was natural to employ the subjunctive following *quam* after infinitives dependent on *malo*, as Asin. 121, moriri sese mavolet quam non reddat; 811, emori me malim quam non indicem; Aul. 12, inopem optavit potius eum relinquere quam commonstraret; 661, emortuom me malim quam non dem; Bacch. 512, quam fiat propensior mendicum malim vincere; Cas. 112, me suspendio quam tu potior fias satiust mortuom; And. 798, optavit parere ditias potius quam honeste viveret; Capt. 687, potius me caput periculo, praeoptavisse quam is periret, ponere; M. G. 1115, te verba facere volo. : : qui (vis) potius quam tute adeas, tuam rem tute agas; similarly Men. 1058, certissimumst mepte potius fieri servom quam te emittam; 831, quid mihi meliust quam med adsimulem insanire; Rud. 328, quid mihi meliust quam opperiar erum.

The foregoing 36 examples represent the bulk of the subjunctive *quam*-clauses (barring those with *ante quam* and *prius quam*) in Early Latin. In all of them the conditions were such as to call for a perfectly natural and legitimate use of the subjunctive. The frequency of *quam, potius quam*, in sentences of the types above enumerated naturally tended to bring about the employment of the subjunctive after *potius quam* and *quam* (in the sense of 'rather than') even in cases where its presence is not otherwise easily explicable. In other words, we have a purely formal extension. This explanation, I believe, applies to the following passages: Asin. 816, suspendam potius me quam haec auferas; M. G. 311, mussitabo potius quam interearm; Most. 816b; 846; 884; Poen. 922; Pseud. 554, potius quam id non fiat, dabo; Phor. 408, potius quam litis secter, accipe; Truc. 442; And. 396, inveniet inopem potius quam sinat; Eun. 174; 176; Ad. 498, animam relinquam potius quam illas deseram; Lucil. 208, uxorem caedam potius quam castrem me; Pseud. 367, occidi potius quam cibum praehiberem; H. T. 443; Stich. 449; H. T. 1010; Ad. 240; Cornelia, Peter, p. 222, 14, uti nunc sunt, erunt potius quam res publica profligetur atque pereat; Aul. 436, quid diximus secus quam velles. This last, of course, may be the apodosis of a contrary-to-fact condition ('than you would wish, if it were possible'); cf. Naev. Com. 33, votis me multat meis, quod praeter quam mihi vellem audibam hoc eminus.

With *Antequam* and *Priusquam*.[1]

In the case of the *ante quam* and *prius quam*-clauses, we see the same forces at work as in case of the *potius quam*-clauses. *Quam* was originally just as much a coördinate conjunction in *ante quam* and *prius quam* as in *potius quam, satius quam,* etc. Hence it was naturally followed by the same mood after it as before it. Thus it occurs with:

a) Jussives: Cato, Agr. 117, antequam nigrae fiant contundantur; 143, 2, focum purum, prius quam cubitum eat, habeat, i.e. 'she's to clean her hearth before she's to go to bed'; Cap. 143.

b) Optatives: Rud. 494, utinam te prius quam vidissem, perbiteres; Enn. Trag. 170, utinam mortem oppetam prius quam evenat, i.e. 'I prefer death rather than the occurrence.'

c) Potentials: M. G. 690, prius quam galli cantent (audias); Trin. 886, concubium sit prius quam perveneris; Ad. 397, non prius olfecissem quam coeperet? Ad. 525, prius nox oppressisset quam revorti posset.

d) Purpose clauses: Epid. 277, ut praestines prius quam veniat; Men. 845, adducam qui tollant prius quam faciat; Rud. 455; Truc. 523; Cato, Agr. 113, 1.

e) Substantive clauses: Aul. 154, in rem hoc tuam est. : : ut quidem emoriar prius quam ducam; Merc. 1015, dicamus censeo prius quam abeamus, i.e. 'I urge speaking before leaving;' Enn. 751, cave ne, prius quam hanc a me accipias, amittas.

f) Protasis: And. 376, si suscenseat prius quam perspexerit.

g) Indefinite 2d singular, or by attraction after imperatives.

1) *ante quam*, Cato, Agr. 50, 2, haec facito ante quam incipias; 53, seorsum condito ante quam ocinum des; 113, 1, sinito dies xv ante quam oblinas.

2) *prius quam*, Cato. Agr. 47, prius resicato quam ad arborem ponas; 134, 1, (Cereri sacrum face) prius quam hasce fruges condas; 157, 3, prius quam id imponas, lavato; Merc. 601, prius quam recipias anhelitum, eloquere; Pseud. 241a, at (revoca) prius quam abeat; Rud. 626, praetorquete prius collum quam pervenat; Truc. 51, prius quam unum dederis, centum quae poscat parat; Ad. 583, prius quam ad

---

[1] See Hullihen, Antequam and Priusquam, 1903; Hale, Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, 1894.

portam venias apud lacum est pistrilla; Enn. Trag. 239, inspice hoc facinus prius quam fiat; Cato, Agr. 53, prius quam semen maturum siet secato.

The first seven examples from Cato may be explained either as the result of attraction or as illustrations of the indefinite 2d singular, though Cato does not systematically use the subjunctive either after the imperative or in the case of the indefinite 2d singular; see p. 320, and cf. Agr. 134, 1, prius quam messim facies, oportet; 113, 1, hoc facito pridie quam vinum infundere voles.

For attraction after the imperative, see p. 311.

h) After the infinitive, as the result of attraction, or as a subordinate clause in oratio obliqua, Amph. 533, exire prius quam lucescat volo; Bacch. 174, ne me sinas senem prius convenire quam sodalem viderim; 1030; Merc. 167; M. G. 886; 1095; Poen. 321; 1267, nolo ego istunc enicari prius quam te mi desponderit; Truc. 901, manus votat prius quam habeat quicquam credere; H. T. 478, si intellexerit prius proditurum te tuam vitam quam amittas filium; 816, me istuc ex te prius audisse gaudeo quam argentum haberes; Hec. 145, narrat se ante quam eam uxorem duxisset domum sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

In all of the above passages the subjunctive is to be explained as in case of the *quam*-clauses with *potius* above considered, i.e. we have a regular and normal use of the mood. If it were necessary, one might easily go further and explain the subjunctive with *prius quam* as after the analogy of the subjunctive with *potius quam*, for *prius quam* is very frequently used in the sense of 'rather than' instead of in the strictly temporal sense.

The following three examples are the only ones remaining of *prius quam* with the subjunctive in Early Latin. They are all easily explained as following the analogy of the uses above enumerated: Amph. 240, animam omittunt prius quam loco demigrent; Aul. 336, ad ravim poscam prius quam quicquam detur; Merc. 559, prius conveniam quam redeam.

Hale (Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, p. 84 ff.; Hale-Buck, Latin Grammar, § 507, 4) refers the subjunctive with *ante quam, potius quam, prius quam* to an 'anticipatory' origin; but the considerations I have set forth above make his explanation seem to

me less probable. An idea of expectation is, of course, often present
in these clauses, but that is a necessary result of the meanings of the
particles introducing them. The positive evidence in favor of the
existence of an anticipatory subjunctive in Latin is too slight to
warrant its recognition here.

SUBJUNCTIVE IN INDIRECT QUESTIONS.[1]

The origin of the employment of the subjunctive in indirect ques-
tions in Latin is not easy to determine. Originally these questions
stood in the indicative, and that mood is still common in Early
Latin; see p. 120 ff.

Two factors may have contributed to the establishment of the
subjunctive. The first of these is the deliberative subjunctive. No
less than 200 out of the 1150 indirect questions in Early Latin are
merely dependent deliberatives, e.g. Amph. 1056, quid agam nescio;
Bacch. 745, loquere quid scribam; Merc. 247, quid facerem cura
cruciabar; M. G. 1034, scin quid facias; Pers. 148, praecipe quid
fabuletur, ubi se natam praedicet. The great frequency of this type
may have ultimately led to the employment of the subjunctive also
in indirect questions of fact, like Curc. 279, auscultemus quid agat;
Rud. 628, quid sit expedi.

The second factor which may have contributed to the use of the
subjunctive is the potential use. In the case of several verbs the
transition from the notion of future contingency denoted by the po-
tential subjunctive to the notion of actuality is simple and natural.
This is particularly true of *malle, velle, decere, opus est, usus est,
posse,* and occasionally of others. Thus in Capt. 270, servosne esse
mavelis, memora mihi, 'would you prefer' passes almost inevitably
into 'do you prefer,' i.e. 'whether you (actually) prefer.' So in the
following: Cas. 280, eloquere quid velis; Amph. 201, quo modo et
verbis quibus deceat fabularier, volo meditarier; Men. 384, miror
quid hoc sit negoti (cf. Asin. 407, quid hoc sit negoti, practically in
the sense of the indicative, along with the other similar examples
of the same use cited in the same connection, p. 200 f.); M. G. 1097,
dixi quo pacto id fieri possit; Stich. 57, quaeramus quid usus sit;

[1] Becker, De syntaxi interrogationum obliquarum apud priscos scriptores Latinos,
in Studemund's Studien, i, 165 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 277 ff.

61, meministis quod opus siet; 573; And. 287, nec clam te est quam
inutiles sient; 811, quam sit facile, commonent; Rud. 1329, elo-
quere quantum postules. In all these the potential notion is so
slight that the idea of actuality easily develops. Precisely the same
is true in English. When I say, 'Tell me what you would prefer,'
I virtually mean, 'Tell me what you (do) prefer.' So very likely in
Latin. Without any effort to gather complete material under this
head, I have noted 75 instances of indirect questions of fact which
may have developed from potentials. In addition to the instances
above cited cf.: Amph. 172; Asin. 88; Bacch. 1133; Capt. 376;
Cas. 287; 353; Cist. 57; Curc. 456; Merc. 7; Poen. 92; 574; 856;
1008; Pseud. 278; Rud. 991; And. 50; 234; 536; 537; Eun. 662;
Hec. 465. Certain types are particularly common, e.g. expressions
like *eloquere quid velis; scio quid velis; nescio quid velis.* The great
frequency of these makes it an easy step to expressions like *scio quid
sit; nescio quid sit,* from which the idiom would easily extend itself.
Analogy, it should be noted, works quite as much under the influence
of a single speech-form in very frequent use, as under the influence
of a number of similar forms. This is just as true of syntax as of
inflections. Hence it is not methodically extreme to suggest that
the *nescio quid velis* type may have been largely responsible for the
development of the potential question into the question of fact.

Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 278, recognizes the share of the de-
liberative in the origin of the indirect question, but sees no possi-
bility of a potential origin for any of these questions.

Classification of Indirect Questions.

Indirect Questions are introduced by over twenty-five different
particles. The broadest division is into word questions or pronomi-
nal questions on the one hand, and sentence questions on the
other.

Both classes again fall into questions of fact (Delbrück's 'Ist'-
Fragen) and dependent deliberatives (Delbrück's 'Soll'-Fragen,= our
'Subjunctive of Duty or Fitness'). The word questions (1025) are
much commoner than the sentence questions (125); while the ques-
tions of fact (950) are much commoner than dependent deliberatives
(200).

I shall classify the material accordingly under two general classes: Word (or Pronominal) Questions, and Sentence Questions. Under each I shall give illustrations of questions of fact and of dependent deliberatives.

I. WORD (OR PRONOMINAL) QUESTIONS.

These are introduced by various pronouns and particles:

1. Most frequently (over 600 instances) by *quis, quid, ecquis*,[1] *numquis*.[2]

a) Questions of fact (500): e.g. Amph. 270, observabo quam rem agat; Capt. 509, rogo Philocratem ecquis noverit; Poen. 97, neque scit quid siet; 558, meminisse quo modo dederis.

b) Dependent deliberatives (130): Amph. 1056, quid agam nescio; Bacch. 745, loquere quid scribam; Epid. 317, ei praemonstrabitur quo pacto fiat; Pers. 148, praecipe quid fabuletur; Pseud. 675, quo modo agerem, instituta habebam; Acc. 628, quid capias vide.

In a number of cases *quod* is used for *quid* in indirect questions, viz. Cist. 707, scit quod velit; Merc. 628, tibi in manu est quod credas; ego quod dicam mihi in manu est; M. G. 624, si quidem te quod faxis pudet; Poen. 547, narravi vobis quod opus sit; Rud. 1355, meus arbitratus est lingua quod iuret mea; Stich. 61, meministis quod opus sit; H. T. 108; 210; 221; Acc. 432; Cato, Agr. 89, consideres quod satis sit.

This employment of *quod* for *quid* is usually explained as a relic of the period when *quid* and *quod* were both used indiscriminately as relative and interrogative. Cf. Frank, Semantics of Modal Construction, Classical Philology, ii, p. 174, footnote, who cites Cato, Agr. 148, quid volet, faciet. Cf. also Aul. 348, quippe qui ubi quid surripias nil est.

2. Introduced by *ut* (82).

a) Questions of fact (60): Amph. 136, memorat legiones ut fugaverit; Trin. 657, scibam ut deceret; Eun. 438, scin ut urat; Hec. 784, audisti ut sit.

b) Dependent deliberatives (22): Aul. 550, ut te accusem meditabar; Phor. 181, neque uti devitem scio; Cato, Agr. Cap. 168, luxum ut excantes.

---

[1] Bacch. 1084a; Most. 907; Rud. 125; Stich. 366; Eun. 519; Ad. 877.
[2] Poen. 1008.

3. Introduced by *quam* **(49).** These are all questions of fact.
Examples: Amph. 354, nescio quam tu familiaris sis; And. 812,
quam sit facile commonent; Phor. 161, exspecto quam mox veniat;
Cato, Agr. 30, cogitato quam longa siet.

4. Introduced by *ubi* **(42).**

a) Questions of fact (40) : Amph. 336, non ubi sim scio; Cist.
502, quaere ubi sit; H. T. 820, scin ubi sit? Ad. 527, rogitabit ubi
fuerim.

b) Dependent deliberatives : Cas. 875, neque ubi lateam scio.

5. Introduced by *quantus* **(31).** These are all questions of fact,
Amph. 508, experior quanti facias uxorem; Pseud. 305, paenitet
quanto fuerit usui; H. T. 747, haud scit quantum damnum adportet.

6. Introduced by *quo* **(31).**

a) Questions of fact (25): Bacch. 144, quo eveniat dis in manu
est; Cist. 169, observavit quo deferat; And. 399, vide quo me
inducas.

b) Dependent deliberatives (6): Cas. 875, neque quo fugiam
scio; H. T. 946, ut quo se vortat nesciat.

7. Introduced by *qui* **('how,' 'why') (29).**

a) Questions of fact (14): Men. 337, miror qui noverit; H. T. 362,
demiror qui potueris.

b) Dependent deliberatives : Most. 715, repperi qui ducerem;
Poen. 1208, qui sperem hauscio; Hec. 103, qui credam, dic.

8. Introduced by *quin* **('why not') (16).** These are all questions
of fact, Amph. 750, mirum quin te advorsus dicat; Pers. 433, mirum
quin tibi ego crederem ; Merc. 204; Most. 493; Trin. 495; 967.

9. Introduced by *unde* **(22).**

a) Questions of fact (15) : Curc. 596, rogat unde habeam; 608,
dixi unde pervenerit; Merc. 221; And. 750.

b) Dependent deliberatives (7): Cist. 671, neque unde auxilium
expetam habeo; Most. 430, speculabor unde sarcinam imponam;
Pseud. 106.

10. Introduced by *uter* **(12).**

a) Questions of fact (10) : Rud. 752, contende uter sit verior; H.
T. 326, utram malis vide; Hec. 465.

b) Dependent deliberatives (2): Trin. 227, neque cogitatumst
utrum expetessam; Poen. 1242.

11. **Introduced by** *qualis* (12). These are all questions of fact, Bacch. 786, nosces illum qualis sit; Pseud. 275, scimus te qualis sis; And. 503; Eun. 758.

12. **Introduced by** *quot* (9). These are all questions of fact, Pers. 187, si scis quot habeas digitos; Ad. 555, scire quot mihi sint domini; Lucil. 688, quot fuerint.

13. **Introduced by** *cur* (*quor*) (4). These are all questions of fact, Capt. 1007, scio cur adsimules; Cas. 517, cur amem me castigare, id ponito ad conpendium; Merc. 504; H. T. 1.

14. **Introduced by** *quam ob rem* (12). These are all questions of fact, Amph. 17, quam ob rem venerim dicam; H. T. 943, rogitato quam ob rem faciam; 944; Hec. 205.

15. **Introduced by** *quapropter:* Amph. 86, mirari quapropter curet; Pseud. 498.

16. **Introduced by** *quare:* Eun. 11, causam dicere quare sit.

17. **Introduced by** *quoia* (4): Merc. 200, rogitare quoia esset; 721; Rud. 478; Hec. 7b.

18. **Introduced by** *quoiatis* (3): Men. 341, rogitant quoiatis sit; Poen. 993; Acc. 625.

19. **Introduced by** *qua* (3).

a) Question of fact, Ad. 689, num prospexti qua fieret.

b) Dependent deliberatives, Rud. 812, donec qua abeat nesciat; 225.

20. **Introduced by** *quotumus:* Pseud. 962, quotumas aedis dixerit id incerto scio.

21. **Introduced by** *ad quo:* Afran. 278, scire ad quo (= in quantum, Nonius, 76, 8) te expediat loqui.

22. **Indirect questions depending on** *rogasne* **or some similar word understood** (15): Men. 299, ubi me novisti? :: ubi ego te noverim? Epid. 215, id qui animum advorterim? Trin. 1050; And. 191, hoc quod sit? Eun. 74; 523; 651; Phor. 122; 685; Hec. 716; Ad. 84; 374.

In the two following we have -*ne* as well as *quid*, Eun. 191, egone quid velim? Cas. 117, egone quid faciam?

These questions are usually questions of fact. Exceptions are Ad. 733, quid facias? Eun. 74; Hec. 716, which are dependent deliberatives. Cf. Eun. 837, where *rogas* is expressed.

23. Introduced by *quoad* ('how soon'): Phor. 462, percontatum ibo quoad se recipiat.

24. Introduced by *quorsum* (6): And. 176, verebar quorsum eva-deret; 126; 264; Eun. 155; 305; Hec. 193.

25. Introduced by *si* (28). *Si* has secondarily developed an inter-rogative force in certain connections. The way in which this arose, may be seen in a sentence like Trin. 148, ausculto si quid dicas; originally: 'I am listening, in case you should say[1] anything;' hence, 'whether you say.' Examples:

exspecto (7): Trin. 98, exspecto si quid dicas; Asin. 528; Cas. 540; Poen. 12; 1392, exspectabam si qui eas adsereret; Eun. 594; Enn. Ann. 234.

opperior: Truc. 692, opperiar si veniat.

maneo: Cas. 542, si se arcessas manet.

miror: And. 175, mirabar si sic abiret; Phor. 490; cf. Amph. 621.

Other verbs: perscrutor, Aul. 620; persequor, Cist. 183; operam do, Cist. 185; Trin. 119; quaero, Vid. 56; observo, Vid. 68; per-contor, Merc. 623; venio, M. G. 1158; mitto, Stich. 151; adeo, Hec. 429; viso, Ad. 549; obtueor, Most. 838; manum porrigo, Pseud. 1148; commercor, Capt. 27; 100.

In a dissertation, Ecqui fuerit *si* particulae in interrogando Latine usus, and in Revue de Philologie, xxxii, p. 47 ff., Felix Gaffiot denies this interrogative use of *si* for Plautus, as he does in fact for all authors prior to Livy. The examples above cited, he interprets as purely conditional in character. But his attitude toward these clauses seems quite unnecessary, and even to involve unnatural in-terpretations.

II. Sentence Questions.

These may be either single or double. Delbrück (Vergl. Synt. iii, p. 279) expresses the conviction that in sentence questions we have only questions of fact. But such is not the case. One of his own examples, Pseud. 709, dic utrum Spemne an Salutem te salutem, is a dependent deliberative. There are many others, especially in double questions. Examples will be given below.

[1] For the origin of *si* with the present subjunctive in conditional sentences, see p. 272.

<center>A. SINGLE QUESTIONS.</center>

1. Introduced by *-ne* (19): Amph. 715, valuissesne exquisivi; Capt. 917, percontabatur possentne; Most. 166, contempla satin me deceat; Trin. 70, rogitas tene obiurigem; Ad. 12, pernoscite furtumne existimetis; Cato, Agr. 1, 4; 2, 1.

2. Introduced by *utrum* (4): Hec. 618, tua refert nil, utrum illaec fecerit; 326; Liv. And. 19, utrum virginem oraret; M. G. 515, where some read the indicative.

3. Introduced by *an* (20): M. G. 448, qui scio an[1] ista non sit; Poen. 557, itane temptas an sciamus; Pseud. 432, fors fuat an istaec dicta sint; Phor. 774, haud scio an mutet; 717, forsitan nos reiciat, originally, 'it may be a chance whether;' so also Eun. 197. In the last two passages Fleckeisen reads *fors fuat an.* Acc. 121, fortasse an sit quod vos hic non mertet metus; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 23, 8, haut scio an partim eorum fuerint.

4. Introduced by *num* (3): C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 234, rogavit num ferrent; Eun. 663, vise num sit; Pers. 77, visam num afuerit febris.

5. Without introductory particle: Stich. 33, vivant, valeant neque participant nos; Truc. 779, volo scire fateamini; H. T. 454, sit rogas? Ad. 619, rogito quid agat, iam partus adsiet.

Most of the foregoing examples are questions of fact. Liv. And. 19, utrum virginem oraret, is a dependent deliberative. The only other examples of the same kind among these single indirect questions are: Epid. 543, hauscio an congrediar; Most. 783, hauscio an conloquar.

<center>B. DOUBLE QUESTIONS.</center>

These assume a great variety of forms. While questions of fact are much commoner than dependent deliberatives, yet the latter occur with some frequency. They are indicated in the following lists by (del.). Examples:

1. Type . . . *an* (16): Men. 722, quid id ad me tu possis an sis abitura? Rud. 580, eluas tu an exungare ciccum non interduim;

---

[1] For a discussion of the question whether *an* in this and similar questions arises by ellipsis, see Morris, The Sentence Question in Plautus and Terence (Amer. Jour. Phil. ix, x); also below, p. 485 f.

Aul. 730, incertumst abeam an maneam, an adeam, an fugiam (del.); Curc. 463 (del.); Rud. 213 (del.); 1106; Stich. 311; Enn. Trag. 387.

2. Type . . . *anne :* Amph. 173, nec aequom anne iniquom imperet cogitabit; Eun. 554, rogitando sanus sim anne insaniam.

3. Type *-ne . . . an* (13): Pers. 33, haec dies summa est sitne libera an serviat (del.); Capt. 270; And. 209, nec certumst Pamphilumne adiutem an auscultem seni; 535; Ad. 4; 241; Men. 574; Trin. 102; 210; Enn. Ann. 143, 4.

4. Type *-ne . . . anne* (4): Lucil. 472, suspendatne se anne (an in, *codd.*) gladium incumbat; Cas. 515; Hec. 122.

5. Type *utrum . . . an* (6): M. G. 345, scire utrum viderim an illic faciat; Stich. 76, ratiocinor utrum lacessam an temptem (del.); Cist. 679; Men. 386; 887 (del.).

6. Type *utrum . . . anne :* Bacch. 576, percontarier utrum aurum reddat anne eat.

7. Type . . . *-an . . . -ne :* Stich. 203, perquirunt alienum aes cogat an pararit praedium uxorin sit reddenda dos.

8. Type . . . *-ne.* Enn. Ann. 55, 8, certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent (del.).

9. Type *utrum -ne . . . an* (5): Capt. 268, utrum strictimne adtonsurum dicam esse an per pectinem (del.); Trin. 306; Pseud. 709 (del.); Eun. 721; Bacch. 500.

10. Type . . . *an non* (5): Merc. 592, redeat an non nescio; M. G. 1265; 1336; Lucil. 885; Aul. 431.

11. Type *utrum . . . -ne . . . an non :* Most. 681, videndumst utrum eae velintne an non velint.

12. Type *ne . . . necne* (8): Cas. 572, percontarier adsitne ei animus necne adsit; Epid. 322, sitne quid necne sit scire cupio; Bacch. 400; Capt. 283; 711, cogitato emitteresne necne; Pseud. 451.

13. Type . . . *necne* (10): Epid. 461, non scio molestum necne sit; Merc. 457; M. G. 1051; Trin. 850; Cato, Agr. 108, 1.

14. Type *-ne . . . an non* (5): Capt. 455, dubitavi emeremne an non emerem (del.); Merc. 452, qui scio venirene eam velit an non velit; Phor. 445, vise redieritne an non; Hec. 508; 558.

15. Type *ne . . . ne :* Hec. 664, videte remissan opus sit, redductan domum.

Other Logical Types of Indirect Questions.

Most of the indirect questions embraced in the foregoing classification have been either questions of fact or dependent deliberatives. Only rarely do we find anything else. I have noted only Capt. 711, cogitato qualem gratiam haberes, emitteresne necne; And. 258, quid facerem, si quis roget; Rud. 379, rogas quid faceret. The first two of these are apodoses of contrary-to-fact conditions; the last is a subjunctive of unfulfilled past obligation ('what he ought to have done').

Future Time in Indirect Questions.

In some 68 instances of indirect questions of fact we find that the indirect question refers to time relatively future to that of the governing verb.[1] Examples: Epid. 320, exspectando quo modo dicta evenant; Merc. 110, timeo quid sit; M. G. 299, quid me fuat nescio; Trin. 594; Poen. 1249; H. T. 188; Men. 704, provisam quam mox redeat; M. G. 304, insidias dabo quam mox recipiat; 793; Phor. 161, exspecto quam mox veniat; 606; Asin. 51, quo evadat sum in metu; Bacch. 144; Most. 132; 395; Poen. 172; Pseud. 1102; Truc. 549; Phor. 111; 608; Hec. 279, nec qui eveniat scio; Trin. 98, exspecto si quid dicas, along with the 28 other indirect questions introduced by *si;* Pers. 716, qui scio an adseratur; H. T. 999, haud scio an ducat; Phor. 774, haud scio an mutet animum; Enn. Trag. 387; Bacch. 575, percontaris utrum aurum reddat anne eat; Merc. 592, redeat an non nescio; Lucil. 885.

Sometimes we have a future from a past standpoint, e.g. Poen. 1392, exspectabam si qui adsereret; Enn. Ann. 234, exspectans si mussaret; And. 175, mirabar si sic abiret; Phor. 490, mirabar si afferres.

It will be noted that the future force of the dependent verb is assisted by the context in most of the examples cited. Thus the governing verb often necessarily involves the idea of futurity, e.g. *timeo, exspecto, proviso, metuo.* So also the employment of *mox*, and even the dependent verb itself, e.g. *evado, evenio, moriar, abeo, redeo,* etc. The future force of indirect questions with *si* is, of course, perfectly natural, as these by origin are simply 'should'-'would' conditions that have become indirect questions.

---

[1] Naturally *all* dependent deliberatives refer to the future.

Hale sees in some of the foregoing examples a survival of the Indo-European pure future use of the subjunctive; see his Anticipatory Subjunctive in Greek and Latin, p. 34.

Futurity is also occasionally denoted by the periphrastic conjugation, e.g. Bacch. 722, nescio quid acturus sim; Truc. 338, praedivinant quo die essuri sint; H. T. 569, metui quid futurum esset; Hec. 614, incertus sum quid facturus sim; M. G. 1183; Pers. 296; Poen. 817; Pseud. 567; Merc. 572; Epid. 377, scitis ut futura sint; Hec. 567, ut laturus sit non clam me est; Men. 722, quid id ad me tu possis an sis abitura.

Prolepsis in Indirect Questions.

Prolepsis occurs repeatedly in indirect questions, e.g. Amph. 485, hoc scitis quid siet; 524, ut scires rem ut gessissem; 662; Men. 519, rem ut sit gesta eloquar; Trin. 698, scio te ut animata sis; Hec. 567; Capt. 376, qui me quid agitem, omnem rem perferat; Cas. 637, time hoc quid sit; Epid. 575, hanc quae sit nescio; Men. 881, ne me indicetis qua platea aufugerim; M. G. 925; Poen. 1121; Pseud. 1212; Rud. 1068; Trin. 960; H. T. 662; Eun. 374; 1035; Hec. 350; Eun. 566; Curc. 590; Trin. 873; Acc. 19; Cato, Agr. 116. The phenomenon is commonest in the case of word (or pronominal) questions, especially questions of fact introduced by *quis*. I have noted only one instance of prolepsis in dependent deliberatives, viz. Stat. 80, quos neque ut adprendas neque uti dimittas scias. Among sentence questions prolepsis is rare. I have noted only Cato, Agr. 108, 1, vinum experiri duraturum sit necne.

Words and Phrases Followed by the Subjunctive of Indirect Question.

The subjunctive of indirect question is used with the following verbs and phrases. Where no numeral follows, but a single instance has been noted.

accipio (2), Trin. 10; admiror, H. T. 827; agitur, H. T. 476; ambiguom, Trin. 594; animadvorto, Cato, Agr. 1, 2; appello, Poen. 992; arbitror, Aul. 607; arbitratus, Rud. 1355; arbiter (2), M. G. 158; attendo (2), Phor. 24; audio (7), Poen. 1404; aucupo, M. G. 995; ausculto (3), Bacch. 404; calleo, H. T. 548; canto, Rud. 478;

castigo, Cas. 517; cf. Pliny, Epp. iii, 5, 16, repeto me correptum cur ambularem; caveo, Cato, Agr. 5, 6; cedo (5), H. T. 662; celebrescit, Acc. 274; celo, Pers. 221; certo (2), Enn. Ann. 55, 8; certus, And. 209; circumspecto, Eun. 602; cogito (19), Amph. 173; cognosco (6), Cato, Agr. 157, 1; commemoro (3), Phor. 715; commoneo, And. 812; comparo (3), Pers. 325; Acc. 309 (here *comparo = aestimo*); commonstro (2), Curc. 590; confero, Pseud. 278; conicio (2), Cas. 95; confingo, Phor. 130; coniectura (2), Poen. 91; considero (3), Cato, Agr. 89; conspicio, Trin. 636; consulo (8), Men. 700; consulto, M. G. 1097; contemplor, Most. 172; contendo, Rud. 752; curo (3), Rud. 1068; cura (4), Men. 761; decerno, Pacuv. 35; declaro, H. T. 284; delico (= *indico*), Acc. 1; demiror (5), H. T. 362; depugno, Trin. 305; demonstro (2), Aul. 716; dico (55), Pseud. 709; disco, H. T. 971; disputo, Most. 88; do, Lucil. 581; dubito (2), Capt. 455; ecfor, Pacuv. 292; eloquor (8), Merc. 504; em, And. 619; enarro, Ad. 365; enodo (2), Pacuv. 283; erogito, Capt. 952; erro, M. G. 793; evado, Eun. 517; existimo, Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1; expedio (3), Rud. 628; experior (18), Stich. 311; explano, Phor. 380; explico, Acc. 342; exquiro (5), Trin. 217; exspecto (7, apart from *exspecto si;* see above p. 331), Phor. 606; fallo, Epid. 239; falsus, Men. 755; fateor (2), Plaut. Frag. 41; habeo, 'know' (4), Cist. 671; haereo, Eun. 848; ignarus, Hec. 676; impero, And. 490; incertus (13), H. T. 188; indico (3), Pers. 590; inspicio, Curc. 427; instituo, Pseud. 675; intellego (7), M. G. 867; interest (2), And. 794; interpretor, Pacuv. 151; interrogo (3), Poen. 731; interviso, Stich. 456; invenio (10), Merc. 254; investigo (2), Aul. 714; iudex, Ad. 4; lego, Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 37, 4; liquet, Trin. 227; loquor (7), Merc. 892; meditor (5), Amph. 201; memini (5), Phor. 224; memoro (2), Capt. 270; metuo (4), Truc. 809; metus (4), Trin. 1003; miror (17), And. 750; mirus (5), Stich. 674; moneo, Ad. 429; monstro (2), Epid. 536; narro (10), Hec. 145; nescio (86), Merc. 457; nosco (19), Trin. 92; nuntio, Amph. 195; obliviscor, H. T. 849; obnitor (*obnoxius, al.*), Poen. 518; observo (14), Men. 789; occulto, Pers. 222; ostendo (6), H. T. 155; paenitet (7), Truc. 533; participo, Stich. 33; percontor (8), Bacch. 575; perdoceo, Poen. 195; perdisco, Truc. 23; perfero, Capt. 376; periclitor, Amph. 689; periclum (4), Hec. 766; ratio (4), Capt. 23; pernosco (4), Ad. 13; perquiro (2), Stich. 202; perscrutor, Aul. 620; perspicio (3), Stich. 604; pertineo,

Rud. 1106; pervestigo, Merc. 935; potestas, Trin. 822; praecipio, Pers. 148; praedico, Poen. 1245; praedivino, Truc. 338; praemonstro (2), Trin. 854; profero, Lucil. 511; proloquor (2), Capt. 5; prospicio (2), Ad. 690; proviso (3), Ad. 890; pudet, M. G. 624; puto, H. T. 485; quaero (20), H. T. 658; quaerito (3), Men. 575; ratiocinor (2), Stich. 76; ratus, Acc. 432; recordor, Men. 972; refert (7), Curc. 396; reperio, Hec. 288; renuntio, Hec. 508; reputo (3), Trin. 256; requiro, Most. Arg. 9; rescisco (4), And. 967; reviso (2), Eun. 923; rogito (22), Men. 115; rogo (25), Hec. 558; scio (220), Capt. 283; scisco (3), Pacuv. 214; sciscitor, Eun. 548; scribo, Enn. Trag. 173; sentio (5), Trin. 639; servo, Lucil. 715; specto (?), Cas. 871; speculor (2), Most. 430; spes, Merc. 363; summa, Pers. 33; suspīcio, Merc. 213; tempto (4), M. G. 1336; teneo (4), Pseud. 217; timeo (12), And. 264; turbo, Epid. 312; vereor (3), And. 176; video (51), Most. 681; viso (12), Pers. 77.

We find indirect questions also with the following phrases: quid ad me (attinet), (3), Epid. 76; Men. 722; animum advorto (3), Trin. 842; animum attendo, And. 8; certiorem (certius) facio (4), Cas. 353; Men. 763a; certamen cernitur, Bacch. 399; specimen cernitur, Most. 132; clam (me) est (4), Hec. 261; facio indicium (3), Hec. 546; in manu est (3), Bacch. 144; insidias do (2), M. G. 304; subduco ratiunculam (2), Capt. 193; in mentem venit (3), Merc. 294; tanti facio, Merc. 7; nili facere, M. G. 168; parvi pendo (3), H. T. 715; flocci facio (2), Trin. 992; flocci aestimo, Plaut. Frag. Fab. Inc. 132; floccum interdo, Trin. 994; ciccum interdo, Rud. 580; dolum confingo, Capt. 36; consilium capio, Eun. 613; quid est, Lucil. 729; in memoria habeo, Poen. 1279; in pectore foveo, Bacch. 1076; pectus pungit aculeus, Trin. 1000; da pignus, Poen. 1242; fors fuat Pseud. 432; fortasse, Acc. 122; in te est, M. G. 1051; operam do, And. 307; causam dico, Eun. 11; quid adfers, Phor. 1025; in pauca verba confero, Asin. 88; praeceptis onero, Pseud. 764; viam do, Epid. 193.

Besides this the indirect question may depend upon the general force of the context, particularly in chapter headings, etc. e.g. Cato, Agr. caps. 31; 34; 47; 50, and often.

SUBJUNCTIVE WITH *QUOD,* 'ALTHOUGH.'

In a number of passages in Plautus and Terence we find the sub-
junctive with *quod,* 'although.' The origin of this use is obscure.
The instances are the following: Asin. 757, quod amicum nominet;
758, quod illa amica amatorem praedicet; 761, quod dicat allatam
epistulam; 796, quod simulet; Aul. 91, quod quispiam ignem quae-
rat, exstingui volo; Cas. 127, quod postules; so Rud. 1150; M. G.
162, quod dicat; And. 395, quod speres; H. T. 671, quod sperem;
Eun. 785, sane quod tibi nunc vir videatur, nebulo est; Eun. 1064,
quod dicas; Ad. 162, quod purges.

ITERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

This use is not ordinarily recognized as occurring before Caesar,
and it did not become prevalent till the period of Silver Latin; yet
the following examples seem to belong under this head:[1] Bacch. 431,
ubi revenisses domum; Scipio, p. 210 (Meyer), ubi agros optime
cultos atque villas expolitissimas vidisset, in his regionibus murum
statuere avebat; Bacch. 433, quom librum legeres; 433, si unam
peccavisses syllabam; Enn. Ann. 189, hostem qui feriet mihi erit
Karthaginiensis, quisquis siet, cuiatis siet, 194, 1, quocum libenter
mensam partit, magnam quom partem diei trivisset.

As regards the origin of the usage, I follow Hale, who (Cum-Con-
structions, p. 237 ff.; Cum-Konstruktionen, p. 293 ff.) explains it as
an extension of the narrative *cum*-clause.

Several French scholars, notably Bonnet (Revue de Phil. viii,
p. 75 ff.), Lejay (Revue Critique, 1899, p. 272 f.), Gaffiot (Revue de
Phil. xxvii, p. 164 ff.; xxxii, p. 59 ff.), deny the usage here recog-
nized, and explain the subjunctive as causal.

SEQUENCE OF TENSES IN THE SUBJUNCTIVE.[2]

A. After the Indicative.

I. After Principal Tenses.

1. After the present indicative.[3] Examples of the regular sequence
are:

---

[1] Cf. Lindskog, De enuntiatis condicionalibus, p. 115; Dittmar, Studien z. Lat.
Moduslehre, p. 147 ff.

[2] Wirtzfeld, De consecutione temporum Plautina et Terentiana, 1888.

[3] The historical present is treated later.

Present subjunctive: Men. 840, imperat ut ego illic oculos exuram; Eun. 969, necesse est huic ut subveniam; Most. 203, vix comprimor quin involem illi; Pseud. 276, (voltis) ut male sit mihi; And. 269, hoc timet ne deseras se; Amph. 527, ne legio persentiscat, clam redeundum est mihi. After *novi:* M. G. 452, neque vos qui sitis homines, novi neque scio; And. 503.

Perfect subjunctive: Trin. 543, nemo exstat qui ibi sex menses vixerit; Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; Trin. 207, sciunt id quod in aurem rex reginae dixerit; And. 35, ut semper apud me iusta et clemens fuerit servitus scis; Eun. 81, vereor ne illud gravius tulerit; H. T. 554, neque eo nunc dico quo quicquam illum senserim. With *novi* and *memini:* Aul. 777, si me novisti minus genere quo sim natus; Phor. 224, meministin olim ut fuerit vostra oratio?

A few exceptions to the prevailing usage are found: Merc. 633, quid faceres, men rogas? Rud. 379, rogas quid faceres? And. 963, nemost quem mallem omnium; Eun. 561, nemost quem ego nunciam magis cuperem videre quam te. Here the dependent subjunctive naturally takes the same tense as in the independent usage from which the dependent use is derived. Less clear are Trin. 992, di me perdant si te flocci facio an periisses prius; Phor. 382, proinde expiscare quasi non nosses; 388, quasi non nosses, temptatum advenis; Rud. 218, quam minus servio quam si serva forem nata. With *mirum quin:* Most. 493, mirum quin vigilanti diceret; Pers. 433, mirum quin tibi ego crederem; Trin. 967, mirum quin ab avo eius acciperem. With *mirum quin,* it has been suggested that possibly *erat* is to be supplied.

2. After the future and future perfect indicative.

Present: Aul. 802, ibo intro ut quid huius verum sit sciam; Curc. 45, minus formidabo ne excidat; And. 313, impetrabo ut aliquot nuptiis prodat dies; Men. 270, cavero ne tu delinquas neve ego irascar tibi; H. T. 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero.

Perfect: Epid. 371, parabo aliquam dolosam fidicinam, nummo conducta quae sit.

3. After the present perfect indicative.

Present: e.g. Amph. 177, qui hodie fuerim liber, eum nunc potivit pater servitutis; 869; Asin. 36, modo pol percepi quid istuc sit loci;

Bacch. 370; Capt. 493, qui concilium iniere quo nos victu et vita prohibeant; Curc. 371; Epid. 285, repperi haec te qui abscedat suspicio; 354; 442; Men. 788; Merc. 344; 669; M. G. 1269, induxi in animum ne oderim; 1056; 1097; Pers. 81; 325; 621; Poen. 547; 774; Rud. 611; Truc. 776; And. 892, adducti qui illam hinc civem dicant; Eun. 286; 544; Phor. 522, repperi qui det neque lacrumet; 602; 647; 889; Ad. 54, ea ne me celet, consuefeci filium; 477; 653

Perfect: Curc. 608, dixi tibi unde ad me pervenerit; M. G. 867, modo intellexi quam rem mulier gesserit; H. T. 848, iamne oblitus es inter nos quid sit dictum? 1007; Eun. 420, quo pacto Rhodium tetigerim in convivio numquam tibi dixi? Phor. 577; Hec. 582; 607.

Exceptions. We have the following instances of the present perfect followed by secondary tenses: Cas. 680, huc missa sum tibi ut dicerem; Aul. 133, eo foras ted huc seduxi ut tuam rem tecum hic loquerer; Men. 784, quotiens edixi tibi ut caveres; Most. 715, hoc habet: repperi qui senem ducerem, quo dolo a me dolorem procul pellerem; where Wirtzfeld, op. cit. p. 23, takes *repperi* as an historical perfect. In Asin. 7, we have an ellipsis: quid processerim dicam; (processi) ut sciretis nomen huius fabulae.

II. AFTER HISTORICAL TENSES.

1. After the imperfect indicative. Examples:

Imperfect: Amph. 1096, aedes totae confulgebant tuae quasi essent aureae; Trin. 657, scibam ut esse me deceret; Bacch. 676, an nescibas quam eius modi homini raro tempus se daret? Eun. 155, at ego nescibam quorsum tu ires.

Pluperfect: Pseud. 912, nimis metuebam ne abisses.

By a kind of repraesentatio we find the present subjunctive after the imperfect indicative in Aul. 550, ut te accusem meditabar. The perfect: Enn. Ann. 55, 12, exspectabat populus atque ora tenebat, rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.

2. After the historical perfect. Examples:

Imperfect: Amph. 914, periclitatus sum animum tuom quid faceres et quo pacto id ferre induceres; Curc. 684, metui ne mi hodie apud praetorem solveret; Trin. 1142; And. 582, non nihil veritus sum ne faceres.

Pluperfect: Eun. 517, ubi friget, huc evasit quam pridem pater mihi et mater mortui essent; Ad. 368, mihi, qui id dedissem consilium, egit gratias.

Perfect. Occasionally we find the perfect subjunctive used as an historical tense after the historical perfect indicative: Amph. 431, factumst ut ebiberim; M. G. 262, non potuit quin participaverit; Pers. 583; H. T. 279, hic sciri potuit quo studio vitam exegerit; Hec. 2, intervenit calamitas ut neque spectari potuerit. Combined with the pluperfect: Amph. 745, audivi ut urbem expugnavisses regemque occideris.

By repraesentatio we often find the present subjunctive after the historical perfect, e.g. Amph. 115, adsimulavit se quasi Amphitruo siet; 195, me a portu pater praemisit ut haec nuntiem; Bacch. 533, postremo impetravi ut ne quid ei suscenseat; 589, me misit miles ad eam Cleomachus vel ut Philippos reddat aureos vel ut hinc eat; Cas. 55, armigerum adlegavit qui poscat; Cist. 168, opservavit quo deferat; 567, amplexa est genua plorans, opsecrans ne deserat se; 636; Men. 1057, praecucurristi ut quae fecisti infitias eas; M. G. 1238, istuc curavi ut opinione illius pulcrior sis; Poen. 554, didicimus tecum una ut respondere possimus tibi; Trin. 15, dedi ei meam gnatam quicum una aetatem exigat; H. T. 527, quasi non ditiis abundet gnatus eius profugit inopia; Eun. 96; Hec. 683, huc animum ut adiungas tuom quam longum spatium dedi! Afran. 316, se obsequentem dixi praebeat; Capt. Arg. 7, ut amittatur fecit. Present and imperfect combined: Bacch. 352, feci ut auri quantum vellet sumeret, quantum lubeat ut reddat patri; 689, patrem exoravi : : nempe ergo hoc ut faceret? : : immo tibi ne noceat neu quid suscenseat; Paulus (Meyer), p. 201, id egerunt ut vos potius meum casum doleatis quam ego vostro ingemiscerem.

3. **After the pluperfect indicative**: Men. 592, plus minus quam opus fuerat dicto dixeram ut eam sponsio controversiam finiret; Pseud. 549, rus ut irem iam heri constitueram; Stich. 652, Sticho mandaveram salutem ei ut nuntiaret.

4. **After the historical present.** — Here the present is somewhat more frequent than the imperfect, notably so in Plautus.

Present, e.g. Amph. 205, Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant suam; 240, animum omittunt priusquam loco demigrent; 1069, accurro, ut

sciscam quid velit; 1093, invocat deos ut sibi auxilium ferant; Capt.
509, rogo Philocratem ecquis hominum noverit; 511, orat obsecratque
eum sibi videre ut liceat; Curc. 330, argenti rogo uti faciat copiam;
355, provocat me in aleam ut ludam; 361; 339; 340; M. G. 116,
inscendo ut rem Naupactum ad erum nuntiem; Most. 1049, capio
consilium ut senatum congerronum convocem; Rud. 605, ago cum
illa ne quid noceat meis popularibus; And. 355, percurro ad forum
ut dicam haec tibi; Eun. 578, edicit ne vir quisquam ad eam adeat;
519; Phor. 93, rogamus quid sit.

Imperfect, e.g. Amph. 214, respondent se et suos tutari posse, pro-
inde uti exercitus deducerent; 225; Bacch. 290, quoniam sentio quae
res gereretur; 301; Merc. 90, servom una mittit, quasi uti mihi foret
custos; Phor. 592, venio ad hominem ut dicerem; H. T. 651, detraho
et eum dico ut una cum puella exponeret; 492; Eun. 581, paucae
quae circum illam essent manent; Ad. 868, dum studeo illis ut quam
plurimum facerem; 365; Enn. Trag. 101, corpus contemplatur unde
corporaret volnus; Ann. 194, 9, quocum multa volutat grandia clam-
que palamque, pudenter qui dicta loqui tacereve posset; Euhem. 515,
postulat ut ipse regnaret; Pacuv. 331, imperat ut deducerem; Acc.
229, hortatur me ut meos manderem natos; Turp. 81, hortatur quam
primum proficisceret; Pers. Arg. 3, emeret suadet.

Pluperfect: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 37, 3, deinde quae ego pro re pub-
lica fecissem leguntur.

The perfect is found in Stich. 366, dum percontor portitores ecquae
navis venerit.

B. After the Subjunctive.

1. Present subjunctive. — The present subjunctive is regularly fol-
lowed by the present and perfect, e.g. And. 687, orare iussit, si se
ames, iam ut ad sese venias.   This is true even when the present is
used in the sense of the imperfect to denote a condition contrary to
fact, as Aul. 523, compellarem illum ni metuam ne desinat.   Exam-
ples of the perfect following the present subjunctive are: Bacch.
1012, nihil est illorum quin ego illi dixerim; Cato, Agr. 5, 2, consi-
deret quae dominus imperaverit; 5, 3, quod dominus crediderit, exigat.

Exceptions: In And. 258, quid facerem, si quis me roget, the im-
perfect of a contrary-to-fact apodosis is naturally unchanged after
the present.   Old law in Gellius v, 19, ut tam filius siet quam si ex

eo natus esset; in Poen. 1251, si id fieri possit, ne indigna indignis darent, *possit* should perhaps be *posset,* which very likely was the reading of A. Recent editors read *possit.*

2. Imperfect subjunctive. — This is regularly followed by either the imperfect or pluperfect. Examples:

Imperfect: Asin 674, si hoc meum esset, hodie numquam me orares quin darem; Bacch. 554, ni ita esset, tecum orarem ut ei quod posses mali facere faceres; Poen. 1066, viverent vellem; 681, videre vos vellem quom huic aurum darem; M. G. 731, qui lepide ingeniatus esset, vitam ei longinquam darent; qui improbi essent, is adimerent animam cito; And. 606, utinam mihi esset aliquid hic quo nunc me praecipitem darem; Eun. 91, utinam esset mihi pars aequa amoris tecum ac pariter fieret, ut hoc tibi doleret; Hec. 756.

Pluperfect: Amph. 524, ex me primo ut prima scires rem ut gessissem; Ad. 217, metuisti, si nunc de tuo iure concessisses paululum, adulescenti esses morigeratus, ne non tibi istuc faeneraret? Phor. 901, verebamini ne non id facerem quod recepissem semel?

Exceptions: By repraesentatio we sometimes find the present used after the imperfect subjunctive, e.g. Cas. 681, missa sum tibi ut dicerem ab ea uti caveas; Poen. 602, liberum ut commostraremus locum, ubi ames, potes, pergraecere; Pseud. 3, si fieri possem certior, ere, quae miseriae te macerent (*macerant* P); 796; Rud. 129, qui adornaret ut rem divinam faciat; Eun. 933; Hec. 547, adeon me esse pervicacem, quoi mater siem, ut eo essem animo; Ad. 316, capite pronum in terra statuerem, ut cerebro dispergat viam. Different is M. G. 963, egone ut ad te ab libertina esse auderem internuntius, qui ingenuis satis responsare nequeas!

The perfect is found after the imperfect subjunctive in Amph. 225, convĕnit, victi utri sint, urbem uti dederent; And. 967, more hominum evenit ut quod sim nanctus mali prius rescisceres. Here the use of the perfect is doubtless influenced by the present *convĕnit* and the present perfect *evenit.* Other examples are: Asin. 443, nam retineri ut quod sit locatum ecficeret; 589, quoi rei? : : qui verberarem asinos si forte occeperint clamare; H. T. 7, nunc qui scripserit et quoia Graeca sit, id dicerem.

3. After the perfect subjunctive. Examples of regular sequence are Cas. 304, metuo ne Olympionem mea uxor exoraverit ne Casinam

ducat; Capt. 395, dicito quo pacto convenerit . . . ut eum redimat et remittat.

4. **After the pluperfect subjunctive,** e.g. Ad. 396, non sex totis mensi- bus prius olfecissem quam ille quicquam coeperet?

C. After the Imperative.

Examples of regular sequence are : Asin. 740, patrem huc orato ut veniat; Capt. 395, dicito quo pacto convenerit; of irregular sequence: Phor. 380, explana mihi qui cognatum me sibi esse diceret.

D. After the Infinitive.

1. **After the present infinitive.**

a) The governing verb is in the present (not the historical present); the dependent tenses are the present and perfect, e.g. Asin. 149, ne id quidem me dignum esse existumat quem adeat; Eun. 1010, non possum satis narrare quos ludos praebueris intus. In Hec. 547, adeon me esse pervicacem censes, ut eo essem animo, si ex usu esset nostro hoc matrimonium, we naturally have the imperfect in the dependent condition contrary-to-fact. Stich. 253, quid igitur me volt? : : tritici modios decem rogare opinor te volt. : : mene ut ab se petam? : : immo ut tu aps te mutuom nobis dares, sometimes cited as an exception to the general principle, is hardly such. *Ut dares* depends logically upon *voluit rogare* to be supplied in thought. Similarly in Persa, 118, memini et scio et te me orare et mihi non esse quod darem, *esse* (dependent upon *memini* under- stood) really refers to the past and so takes secondary sequence ; so H. T. 626.

b) The governing verb is in the future or perfect; the dependent subjunctive stands in the present or perfect, e.g. Amph. 1015, pergam exquirere quis fuerit; And. 196, si sensero hodie quicquam in his nuptiis fallaciae conari, quo fiant minus.

c) The governing verb is in the present perfect, followed by pri- mary tenses, e.g. Amph. 64, me orare a vobis iussit ut conquistores eant per totam caveam; Bacch. 575, nunc me ire iussit ad eam et percontarier utrum aurum reddat anne eat secum; 1082; Capt. 267, ne id quidem, involucre inicere, voluit, vestem ut ne inquinet;

M. G. 971; H. T. 147. A secondary tense follows in Amph. 41, quid ego memorem ut alios vidi commemorare quae bona vobis fecissent?

d) The governing verb is in the imperfect; the dependent subjunctive is in the imperfect or pluperfect, e.g. Pseud. 492, nolebam ex me morem progigni malum, erum ut suom servos criminaret aput erum; Phor. 89, hic solebamus fere plerumque eam opperiri, dum inde iret domum; Trin. 212, hunc aiebant Calliclem indignum civitate ac sese vivere, bonis qui hunc adulescentem evortisset suis.

e) The governing verb is in the historical perfect, regularly followed by the imperfect or pluperfect, e.g. Amph. 880, Mercurium iussi me continuo sequi, siquid vellem imperare; Eun. 870. But several instances occur in which by repraesentatio we find the present or perfect: Bacch. 287, occepi opservare eos quamnam rem gerant; Men. 453; Merc. 419, dixit se redhibere, si non placeat; Pseud. 597, miles dixit septumas esse a porta aedis, ubi illic habitet; And. 687, orare iussit ut venias; Phor. 6, qui nusquam scripsit cervam orare ut subveniat sibi; Hec. 345, intro iit videre quid agat. Perfect: Amph. 1122, dixit eum filium suom esse, qui illos angues vicerit; Poen. 1056, qui potuit fieri ut Carthagini gnatus sis?

f) The governing verb is in the pluperfect: Curc. 425, id te orare iusserat profecto ut faceres; Eun. 699, nec quis esset umquam audieram dicier.

g) The governing verb is the historical present. Here, just as when the clause depends directly upon the historical present itself, we have sometimes the present, sometimes the imperfect, e.g. Cist. 183, iubet illum persequi si qua queat reperire; Asin. 343, me infit percontarier ecquem filium Stratonis noverim; Hec. 116; Aul. 318, infit postulare uti liceret; Rud. 601, videtur rogare scalas ut darem utendas; Trin. 14, quoniam ei, qui me aleret, nil video esse relicui; H. T. 304.

h) The infinitive is independent.

Exclamatory infinitive: Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire.

Historical infinitive: Merc. 240, mihi videri mirum ut illaec capra uxoris simiai dotem ambederit; Lucil. 9, 4, uni se studio omnes dedere verba dare ut caute possint; 9, 7.

2. After the future infinitive.

a) The governing verb is in the present and we have primary sequence, e.g. Asin. 528, an te id exspectare oportet, si quis promittat tibi te facturum divitem si moriatur mater sua ?   M. G. 1414, iuro me nociturum nemini quod ego hic hodie vapularim.

b) The governing verb is in the present perfect, e.g. Hec. 586, ego rus abituram hinc esse certo decrevi, ne mea praesentia obstet neu causa restet.

c) The governing verb is past and we have secondary sequence, e.g. Asin. 363, interminatust nos futuros ulmeos, ni hodie Argyrippo viginti essent argenti minae : Amph. fr. xi, quid minitabas te facturum si istas pepulissem fores ?

But we sometimes have primary sequence, e.g. Bacch. 856, dixin tibi ego illum te inventurum qualis sit ?   Epid. 414, te pro filio facturum dixit rem esse divinam domi, quia Thebis salvos redierit. The future infinitive following the historical present may take either primary or secondary sequence, *e.g.* Amph. 205, Telobois iubet sententiam ut dicant suam : si sine vi et sine bello velint rapta tradere, si quae asportassent redderent, se exercitum reducturum, abituros agro Argivos.

3. After the perfect infinitive.

a) The governing verb is present or future.   Here the sequence is regularly determined by the equivalence of the infinitive, being primary if the infinitive is equivalent to a present perfect indicative, secondary if it is equivalent to a historical perfect.

Equivalent to a present perfect, e.g. Bacch. 864, faxo se haud dicat nactam quem derideat; Merc. 253, capram illam suspicor iam me invenisse, quae sit aut quid voluerit; And. 407, orationem sperat invenisse se qui differat te.   Yet the imperfect occurs Eun. 931, me repperisse quo modo adulescentulus meretricum ingenia posset noscere.

Equivalent to a historical perfect: Epid. 508, Stratippoclem aiunt curavisse ut fieret libera; Aul. 470, credo illi mercedem gallo pollicitos coquos, si id palam fecisset; And. 699.   But at times even after a perfect infinitive equivalent to a historical perfect we find primary sequence, M. G. 1167, (dicas) hinc senem abs te abisse, postquam feceris divortium; Stich. 555, videlicet parcum fuisse

illum senem, qui id dixerit; 557; And. 664, nisi mihi decs satis scio fuisse iratos qui auscultaverim; Phor. 875.

b) The governing verb is past. Here the sequence is regularly secondary, e.g. Bacch. 342, censebam me ecfugisse a vita marituma, ne navigarem tandem hoc aetatis; Merc. 67, atque extemplo inde, ut spectavisset peplum, rus rusum confestim exigi solitum a patre.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMPERATIVE.[1]

The Latin forms designated as present and future imperatives are
an Indo-European inheritance. The present was used to convey
commands which the speaker meant to be executed forthwith; the
future to convey commands whose execution was conceived of as
beginning at a later time. Prohibitions were not expressed in Indo-
European by the imperative, but by the injunctive with *mē*, as
inferred from the state of affairs existing in Vedic Sanskrit. *Mā*
with the imperative is not found until the classical Sanskrit. The
Greek imperative with μή, therefore, and the Latin imperative with
nē are not Indo-European inheritances, but innovations, though both
appear in the earliest literature.

AFFIRMATIVE USES.

PRESENT.

Form.

Doubled forms are occasionally found, especially where the emo-
tion is prominent, e.g. Amph. 765, mane, mane, obsecro; so Merc.
928; H. T. 613; 736; Ad. 264; Pseud. 1284, aperite, aperite;
H. T. 349, redi, redi; Eun. 834, tace, tace, obsecro; Enn. Trag. 323,
eloquere, eloquere; so *age, age* and *agite, agite*, which have become
virtual interjections, e.g. And. 310, age, age; Turp. 207, age, age,
egredere; Lucil. 585, agite, agite.

Plurals are sometimes accompanied by *aliquis* in partitive apposi-
tion, e.g. Men. 674, Erotium aliquis evocate; Merc. 131, aperite

---

[1] V. Loch, Zum Gebrauch des Imperativus bei Plautus; J. Stahl, De natura atque
usu imperativi apud Terentium; Kühner, Ausführliche Gramm. der lat. Sprache, ii,
p. 149 ff.; Delbrück, Vergl. Syntax, ii, p. 357 ff.; Blase, Historische Gramm. der lat.
Sprache, iii, p. 234 ff.; Riemann, Revue de Phil. x, p. 161 ff.

aliquis; 910, aliquis huc foras exite; Pseud. 1284, me adesse aliquis nuntiate; Ad. 634, aperite aliquis.

The present imperative is also often accompanied by reinforcing or modifying expressions, as *amabo, obsecro, quaeso, sis, sodes, age, dum*, etc. Thus:

a) With *amabo*, very frequently in Plautus, in Terence but five times, e.g. As. 894, dice, amabo; Bacch. 100, propera, amabo; Men. 541, amabo, inauris da mihi; Merc. 503, amabo ecastor, eloquere; Most. 166, contempla, amabo; Stich. 752, date mi locum, amabo; Truc. 128, amabo, sine me ire; Eun. 130, hoc agite, amabo; 150, id, amabo, adiuta me; 534, fac, amabo; 663, vise, amabo; 838.

b) With *obsecro*, very common in both Plautus and Terence, e.g. Curc. 308, eloquere, obsecro hercle; eloquere, te obsecro; Bacch. 1026, da mihi cc nummos, te obsecro; Rud. 867, obsecro te, subveni mi; As. 29, dic, obsecro; And. 861, audi, obsecro; H. T. 403, retine me, obsecro; Eun. 421, narra, obsecro; 685, tace, obsecro.

c) With *quaeso*, very frequent, e.g. Amph. 500, imperce, quaeso; Bacch. 744, quaeso, cave; Capt. 570, quaeso hercle, agedum adspice ad me; Men. 498, responde, quaeso; Pseud. 547, da operam, quaeso; And. 8, quaeso, animum adtendite; H. T. 163, quaeso, tibi parce; 971, prius, quaeso, disce; Eun. 562, narra istuc, quaeso; Phor. 141; 350.

d) With *oro*. I have noted only Capt. 1021, sed tu dic, oro; Eun. 912, move te, oro.

e) With *sis*, very frequently, e.g. Amph. 585, sequere, sis; As. 677, cape hoc sis; Merc. 169, hoc sis vide; Most. 892, tace sis; Pers. 316, abi atque cave sis; H. T. 374, vide sis; Eun. 311, fac sis; 799, cave sis; Phor. 59, abi sis; Ad. 766.

f) *Sultis*, rare, not in Terence, e.g. As. 1, hoc agite, sultis; Stich. 220, adeste sultis.

g) With *sodes* (especially in Terence), e.g. Bacch. 837, dic sodes mihi; Men. 545, da sodes abs te; Pers. 318, emitte sodes; And. 85, dic sodes; H. T. 459, aliud lenius sodes vide; 770, dic sodes; Phor. 103, duc nos sodes; 741, concede hinc paulum sodes; Hec. 358; 841; Ad. 517.

h) With *age, agite, agedum, age sis*, very frequent in the dramatists, e.g.:

1) *age, agite:* Amph. 551, age tu i secundum; 750, age me huc

aspice; As. 488, age ambula ergo; Pers. 38, age fi benignus, subveni; Ad. 937, age da veniam filio. *Age* may be used even with the plural, e.g. Cas. 488, age modo fabricamini; M. G. 928, age igitur intro abite; Rud. 808, age adsistite; Stich. 221, age licemini. Plural: Curc. 88, agite, bibite festivae fores; M. G. 1198, agite, abscedite.

2) *agedum*, e.g. Amph. 783, agedum solve eam cistulam; 1081, agedum expedi; As. 746, agedum istum ostende; M. G. 345, agedum ergo face; Eun. 694, agedum hoc mi expedi; H. T. 310.

3) *age sis:* As. 679, age sis hunc delude; Capt. 179, age sis roga emptum.

i) With *modo:* frequently, e.g. Amph. 674, sequere hac me modo; As. 145, me specta modo; Capt. 167, habe modo bonum animum; Curc. 655, sine modo; Men. 148, dic modo; Most. 326, cave modo; Eun. 65, sine modo; 724, id modo dic; Phor. 670, tu modo fac ut ducat; Ad. 280, tace modo; 538, fuge modo intro.

j) With *-dum*, frequently, e.g. As. 585, manedum; Men. 265, cedodum; M. G. 955, circumspicedum; Most. 674, pultadum; And. 29, adesdum; H. T. 249, abidum; Eun. 707, dicdum; Hec. 803; 844, manedum; Pacuv. 202, iteradum. Separated: Men. 378, sine me dum.

k) With *quin*, frequently. The use of *quin* with the imperative seems to be borrowed from its employment in expressions like *quin abis ?* used with imperative force, e.g. Most. 815, quin tu is intro atque otiose perspecta. Examples: Bacch. 276, quin audi; Curc. 240, quin tu perdura; Men. 416, quin tu tace modo; Pseud. 1016, quin sequere ergo intro; Rud. 628, quin tu omitte genua; And. 45, quin dic; H. T. 890, quin tu ausculta; Phor. 350, quin tu hoc age; 486, quin omitte me; Ad. 543, quin tu animo bono es.

l) With *proin, proinde*, e.g. Amph. 311, proin tu istam cenam largire; Stich. 667, proin tu lavare propera; As. 27, proinde istuc eloquere; And. 408, proin tu fac; Eun. 56, proin tu cogita; And. 707, proinde hinc vos amolimini.

m) With *sane* (infrequent), e.g. As. 464, at nosce sane; Pers. 500, cedo sane mihi; 772; H. T. 832.

Function.

Present for future. — While the present regularly and properly is used of acts which the speaker wishes to be performed at once, it

occurs occasionally referring to acts that belong clearly in the future, and under circumstances where the future is more correctly employed, e.g. Capt. 900, bene ambula et redambula; so M. G. 936; Most. 853. Here the act belongs to the future, and that tense is used in Capt. 452; Merc. 327; Pers. 50. Further, the present occurs at times where a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect clearly indicates that the sphere of the imperative is the future, e.g. As. 231, si alius ad me prius attulerit, tu vale; Bacch. 800, impinge pugnum, si muttiverit; Cas. 146, vir si quid volet, me facite accersatis; Cist. 592, vir tuos si veniet, iube domi opperirier; Ep. 423, ubi erit otium, revortere ad me extemplo; Men. 1105, id quod rogabo dicite; M. G. 1394, si non sequitur, rapite sublimen; Pers. 46, quicquid erit, recipe te ad me; 47; And. 848, ubi voles, arcesse; H. T. 618, illa si iam laverit, mihi nuntia. Expressions like Pers. 146, hoc si facturus, face, do not belong here, though cited by Loch, p. 5, as similar to those just mentioned. *Face* in the Persa passage refers to the immediate present.

In Indo-European the future imperative seems to have been used after the present to indicate that the execution of one command was to follow the execution of another, and the same usage was common in Latin (see below under the future, p. 355). Yet even when denoting a subsequent act, the second imperative frequently stands in the present, e.g. Asin. 367, abi et narra; Bacch. 592, abi et renuntia; Cas. 421, intro abi et fac accures; 587, i tu atque arcesse illam; 613, abi et aliud cura; so 718; Pers. 165; Cist. 770, da isti cistellam et intro abi; Men. 220, abi atque obsonium adfer; M. G. 255; 394; Most. 807, i intro atque inspice; 928; Poen. 1116; Pseud. 890, intro abi atque cenam coque; so Aul. 458; Stich. 533, abi intro et lava; Capt. 950, ite actutum, Tyndarum arcessite; Men. 736; 952; Pers. 487; Poen. 424; 1319; Pseud. 349; Stich. 683; Eun. 753, abi tu, cistellam ecfer; 763, abi atque obsera ostium; Phor. 563, abi domum et illam consolare; 309, abi, eum exquire atque huc adduce; so also Stat. 178, abi intro atque istaec aufer. Other examples where the future would naturally be expected are: Ad. 204, cras redi; Eun. 436, immo, auge suspicionem; 970, ego abeo: tu isti narra omne.

Logical force of the present imperative. In its range of meaning the

present imperative covers the entire field between peremptory com-
mands and the humblest request or prayer.   Thus:

a) Commands, e.g. Amph. 628, sequere me; 707, tace; 778, cedo
mi; 984, concedite atque abscedite omnes, de via decedite; Capt. 950,
Tyndarum huc arcessite; 954, age tu illuc procede; 964, tandem
istaec aufer; Men. 696, heus tu, tibi dico, mane, redi; And. 28,
istaec auferte: abite; 299, propera; 579, evocate Davom; 754, dic
clare; 861, sublimen rape; 978, abi, propera, accerse; H. T. 762,
accede huc; 831, cape hoc argentum ac defer; Eun. 505, ehem curate
diligenter istam virginem; 506, vos me sequimini; 625, heus puere
Pamphilam accerse.

b) Requests, e.g. Amph. 38, huc animum quae loquar advortite;
1146, nunc spectatores plaudite : As. 14, date benigne operam mihi;
Cas. 280, eloquere quid velis; Cist. 787, more maiorum date plau-
sum; Curc. 423, cape, signum nosce; Epid. 3, respice vero; Men.
678, pallam, amabo, mihi redde; M. G. 750, commodulum obsona;
Most. 328, sine sine cadere me; Pers. 127, filiam utendam mihi da;
439, huc continuo adduce; Poen. 336, mitte amabo; 350, comperce
amabo attrectare; Trin. 385, sed adde ad istam gratiam unum;
Truc. 118, respice huc modo; And. 24, favete, adeste, rem cognos-
cite; 328, saltem aliquot dies profer; 596, gnatum corrigere enitere;
901, da veniam; sine exorem; H. T. 28, date copiam; 35, adeste,
date potestatem; 339, obsecro aliquid reperi; 845, serva filium et
me; Eun. 281, paululum da mi operae.

c) Advice, e.g. Amph. 277, perge, nox, ut occepisti; gere patri
morem meo; Poen. 309, abi domum ac te suspende (ironical); And.
383, dic te ducturum; 394, patri dic velle; 522, perge facere; H. T.
88, rastros adpone; 373, gemitus abstine; Eun. 609, muta vestem.

d) Warning, e.g. Most. 324, cave ne cadas; 460, fuge, obsecro,
atque abscede; fuge huc, fuge ad me; Pseud. 1144, in hunc intende
digitum: hic lenost; And. 205, cave; 300, verbum unum cave de
nuptiis; 399; 753.

e) Encouragement, e.g. Amph. 545, bonum animum habe; 671,
bono animo es; And. 350, nil periclist: me vide; 409, crede mihi;
H. T. 241, respira.

f) Invitations, e.g. Most. 341, accuba.

g) Challenges, e.g. Epid. 699, da pignus; Pseud. 1070, roga me

xx minis; Truc. 275, pignus da ni ligneae sint; Cas. 301, machinare quidlibet quovis modo.

h) Entreaties, e.g. Amph. 765, mane mane, obsecro; Merc. 928, mane mane, Charine; And. 351, obsecro te, hoc me libera metu; Ad. 155, obsecro, populares, ferte auxilium : subvenite inopi.

i) Wishes, e.g. Curc. 455, leno, salve : : di te ament; and so frequently; Rud. 310, salvete; similarly vale; Capt. 900, bene ambula et redambula.

j) Prayers, e.g. Merc. 850, date, di, quaeso, conveniundi eius copiam; Capt. 976, serva, Iuppiter, me; And. 232, di date facilitatem pariundi; And. 473, Iuno Lucina, fer opem, serva me, obsecro; Eun. 1048, O Iuppiter, serva, obsecro, haec bona nobis.

k) Curses, e.g. Amph. 370, nunc vapula; so 395; Bacch. 579, recede hinc dierecte; Capt. 636, suspende te; Cas. 103, abi dierectus; Most. 8, abi dierecte; Poen. 160; Rud. 1170; Poen. 511, ite in malam crucem; And. 255, abi cito ac suspende te.

l) As protasis, e.g. Amph. 286, modo sis veni huc: invenies infortunium; Asin. 350, ausculta, scies; 723, exopta id quod vis: fiet; 876, sequere hac me modo; faxo ipsum hominem manufesto opprimas; Bacch. 1023, em specta! tum scies; M. G. 520, vise ad me intro; iam scies; Pseud. 49, recita modo; ex tabellis iam faxo scies; Rud. 386, i sane in Veneris fanum; sedentem flentemque opprimes; 1007, verbum etiam adde unum; iam in cerebro colaphos apstrudam tuo; 1010, tange ! adfligam ad terram te; 1088, fac sis aurum ut videam! post ego faciam ut videas cistulam; Phor. 561, audacissime oneris quidvis impone; ecferet.

m) With permissive force, e.g. Aul. 831, vel hercle enica; numquam hinc feres a me; Amph. 956, si quid opus est, impera; Asin. 107, tum tu igitur aliud cura quidlubet; Capt. 978, si quid me vis, impera; Cas. 248, immo age ut lubet; bibe, es, disperde rem; Cist. 771, tene tu cistellam tibi; Men. 425, impera quidvis modo; 690, patiar: tibi habe, aufer, utere vel etiam in loculos compingite; Merc. 907, opta ergo ob istunc nuntium quidvis; 182, quin tu si quid vis, roga; M. G. 676, est te unde hospitio accipiam; es, bibe, animo obsequere atque onera te hilaritudine; 773, utere, accipe; Most. 332, cedo manum. : : em! tene! 394, intus potate hau tantillo minus; 809, qualubet perambula; Pers. 145, quaeso hercle me

etiam vende, si lubet; Stich. 424, abi quo lubet; Trin. 276, adsum; impera quidvis; 384, tibi permitto; posce, duce; And. 546, accersi iube; 848, ubi voles, accerse; 897, quidvis oneris impone, impera. Note the frequency with which the permissive force is emphasized by the presence of *quidvis, si vis, lubet,* etc.

n) Denoting a stipulation, Asin. 231, atque ea lege, si alius attulerit, tu vale.

Future Imperative.

Form.

As already stated, the future imperative in Indo-European referred to future time. The Latin has, in the main, adhered to the Indo-European use. Hence we find the future imperative, —

a) In conjunction with a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect.

1) Future, e.g. Asin. 165; 239, ut voles, ut tibi lubebit, nobis legem imponito; 372, quom imitabor Sauream, caveto ne suscenseas; 375, patitor tu, quom ego te referiam; Aul. 94, tum aquam aufugisse dicito, si quis petet; 340, si quid uti voles, domo abs te adferto; Bacch. 36, ubi me fugiet memoria, ibi tu facito ut subvenias; 83; 443; 729; Capt. 114, sinito ambulare, si foris, si intus volent; Cist. 108, si veniet, nolito acriter eum inclamare; Epid. 263, si placebit, utitor consilium; si non placebit, reperitote rectius; 595; Men. 430, auferto tecum, quando abibis; 529; 547; 727; 1029; Merc. 490; M. G. 866; 933, quom extemplo veniemus, mittitote; 1175; Most. 773; 1121; Pers. 728; Poen. 210; 1084; Pseud. 257; 480; 885; 858; 861; 862; 863; 864; Rud. 813, si appellabit quempiam, vos respondetote; 815; 1421; Stich. 67, si quis quaeret, inde vocatote; 148; 287; Truc. 879, ubi domi metues malum, fugito ad me; And. 863; H. T. 828, quod imperabit, facito; loquitor paucula; 865; 972, si displicebit vita, istoc utitor; Eun. 214; 503, si id non poterit, ad me adducito; 768, si vim faciet, in ius ducito; 1067; Phor. 1027; Hec. 76, si quaeret me, dicito; 769; Enn. Trag. 301, sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito; Titin. 23, qui non reddet, facito ut multetur malo; 169, si erit tibi cantandum, facito exvibrisses; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quom cogitabis, sic in animo habeto; 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto; 14, 4, quae opus erunt, indito; 18, 1; si voles, ad hunc modum vasa componito; 22, 1; 23, 2.

2) Future perfect, e.g. Amph. 501, quod erit natum tollito; 1097; Asin. 228, remeato audacter, mercedem si eris nactus; 371; 800; Bacch. 555, si non fecero, me esse dicito ignavissumum; 712; Capt. 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; Curc. 364, laudato, quando ecfecero; Men. 156, oculum ecfodito, si ullum verbum faxo; M. G. 21; 524, post, quando exierit, cito transcurrito; 160, quemque videritis hominem, huc deturbatote in viam; 565; 806; 927; 1176; Most. 361; Pers. 162, ubi argentum accepero, continuo illam adserito manu; 676; Rud. 755, postea aspicito meum, quando ego tuom inpsectavero; Pseud. 510; 513; 520; 1229; Rud. 815; 1347; Stich. 436; 719; 759; 770; Eun. 596; 853; 1056; Phor. 143; 718, ubi hoc egeris, transito; Ad. 582, ubi ad Dianae veneris, ito ad dextram; 816, quod hinc accesserit, id de lucro putato esse omne; Cato, Agr. 26, ubi erit lectum, oblinito; 30, pabulum aridum quod condideris, conservato.

3) Present with future force: Men. 1093, liber esto, si invenis.

b) In conjunction with a co-ordinate future or future perfect indicative, e.g. Asin. 240, modo tecum argentum adferto; facile patiar cetera; Bacch. 95, argentum iubebo ecferri foras; tu facito obsonatum sit; Men. 538; Merc. 139; 497; M. G. 382, ego eloquar, sed amabo advortite animum; Poen. 346; 599; Rud. 1029; Truc. 726, eloquar, sed tu taceto; Phor. 229, prior adito tu; ego in insidiis ero.

c) Future following the present and denoting a subsequent act, e.g. Amph. 353, abi, advenisse familiares dicito. Here the idea is, 'go, and when you have arrived at your destination, tell, etc.' Similarly: Amph. 770, ⟨i⟩ tu, intus pateram proferto; Asin. 382, i, puere, pulta, atque Sauream evocato; 740, curre, patrem huc orato ut veniat; Bacch. 227, abi intro; ego hic curabo: tu intus dicito; 877; 1175, i hac mecum intro, atque ibi filium concastigato; Cas. 295; 756; Epid. 194, palliolum in collum conice itaque adsimulato quasi, etc.; Men. 436; 736; Merc. 277; 787, i, rogato meum patrem; Most. 578; Pers. 195; 444; Pseud. 20; 161; 647; 986; Stich. 150; 263; 477; Trin. 577; 803; 1103; Truc. 914; Eun. 595, cape flabellum, ventulum huic sic facito; Phor. 664; Ad. 351, abi et rem enarrato omnem ordine; 376, piscis ceteros purga; gongrum istum in aqua sinito ludere; Enn. Trag. 113, audi atque auditis hostimentum adiungito; Titin. 21, aspecta formam atque os contemplato meum;

172.   As observed above (p. 351), this usage seems to have been
Indo-European, being somewhat frequent in Sanskrit; cf. Delbrück,
Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 359; Blase, Hist. Gramm. der lat. Spr. iii, p. 236.
But the subsequent act is often denoted by the present; see above,
p. 351; Neue, Formenlehre der lat. Spr. iii, p. 220 ff.

   d) Combined with adverbs or other time expressions referring to
the future, e.g. Asin. 166, semper tibi promissum habeto; 685, re-
dito huc conticinio; Cas. 210; semper huic verbo vitato; Curc. 30,
semper curato ne sis intestabilis; 526, cras peti iubeto; Men. 437,
tum facito ante solem occasum ut venias; 695, aliam posthac in-
venito; Merc. 375, cras agito; perendie agito; 1021; 770, cras
petito; M. G. 1364, cogitato identidem quam fidelis fuerim; Most.
579, redito huc circiter meridie; 654, petito cras; Pers. 678, rur-
sum te ad me recipito; Poen. 144, postid mihi ignoscito; 807, cras
mane in Comitio estote; Rud. 858, post huc redito atque agitato
hic custodiam; 1417, hic hodie cenato; Trin. 485, semper tu hoc
facito cogites; H. T. 590, at tu posthac comprimito manus; Ad.
426, iterum sic memento.

   e) In other cases the future imperative is shown by the context
to involve a more or less definite reference to future time, e.g. Amph.
917, vel hunc rogato Sosiam; Asin. 91, me defraudato; 101, tibi
optionem sumito Leonidam; 375, aequo animo patitor; Aul. 95, cul-
trum securim fures venisse atque abstulisse dicito; 257, facito ut
memineris; so also, Bacch. 328; Curc. 210; M. G. 354; Pseud. 515;
Stich. 47; Capt. 689, facito ergo ut clueas; Cist. 64, facito ut scias;
Poen. 1414, des facito aut reddas; 1418, facito habeas; Aul. 458,
lege agito mecum; Bacch. 75, simulato me amare; 84, dato; 703,
quantum lubet me poscitote aurum; Capt. 190, curato aegrotos domi;
389, salutem dicito matri et patri; so Curc. 524; Capt. 395, dicito
patri; so 401; 432, cogitato hinc mea fide mitti; 452, bene ambu-
lato; so Merc. 327; Pers. 50; Capt. 721, ergo ab eo petito gratiam
istam; 948, ducito; Cas. 273, eum orato; 309, in furnum calidum
condito atque ibi torreto me; 493, emito sepiolas; 523, facitodum
merula quod cantat; so also Poen. 408, rem divinam facito; Rud.
792; Cas. 832, integrae atque imperitae huic impercito; 870, spec-
tato hinc omnia; Cist. 764, ceterum ex ipsa exquaeritote; Curc. 31,
quod amas amato testibus praesentibus; 138, tu me ne sitiam cu-

rato; 622, intestatus vivito; Poen. 890, sed tu hoc tecum tacitum habeto; Epid. 730, liber esto; so also Men. 1029; 1148; Men. 548, haec me curaturum dicito; 628, properato apsente me comesse prandium; Merc. 115, aspellito; 464, at me incusato; 908, deos orato; Most. 255, ubi tu commoda's, capillum commodum esse credito; 422, illi hoc dicito; 1150; Pers. 159, abs chorago (ornamenta) sumito; 246, tecum habeto. :: et tu hoc taceto; 302, paratum iam esse dicito, iubeto habere animum bonum; 667; Poen. 159, me dato; 181, rogato servos veneritne ad eum tuos; 406, atque audin? :: Veneri dicito multum salutem; 729, portam frangito; 872, nolito devellisse; Pseud. 123, de istac re in oculum utrumvis conquiescito; 545, stilis me totum usque ulmeis conscribito; 652, dato istunc sumbolum ergo illi; 1075, atque etiam habeto mulierem dono tibi; Rud. 1213, dicito daturum meam illi filiam uxorem; Stich. 553; Trin. 295, moribus vivito antiquis; 296; 323, benefacta benefactis pertegito; Truc. 429, sic facito; 953, noster esto, sed de vostro vivito; And. 865, cura adservandum, atque audin? quadrupedem constringito; H. T. 221, periclum ex aliis facito tibi quod ex usu siet; 702, ita ut res sese habet narrato; 783; 943; Eun. 445, par pro pari referto; 712; Phor. 664, petito hasce a me; Ad. 174, in istam partem potius peccato; 500; 574, praeterito hac recta platea; 575; 577; 940; 977; Acc. 373, ilico (= *in eo loco*) habitato; Afran. 230, ipsi me velle vestimenta dicito; Liv. And. Od. 20, ibi manens sedeto; Enn. Ann. 62, aeternum teritote diem concorditer ambo.

Future imperative accompanied by reinforcing expressions. These are much less frequent than with the present imperative. Thus:

a) With *amabo:* As. 939, memento, amabo; M. G. 382, amabo advortito animum.

b) With *obsecro:* Cist. 764, obsecro, exquaeritote; Ad. 281, obsecro te, istum hominem absolvitote.

c) With *quaeso:* Amph. 1097, quaeso, absolvito; As. 375, quaeso, patitor; Capt. 432, te quaeso, cogitato; M. G. 865, quaeso tamen accipito; Poen. 807, cras mane, quaeso, in Comitio estote; Ad. 808, quaeso, hoc facito tecum cogites.

d) With *sultis, sis:* Men. 350, adservatote haec sultis; Poen. 1084, facito sis reddas.

e) With *age:* Bacch. 855, age nunc vincito me; Phor. 1027, age

nunc Phormionem, qui volet, lacessito; Men. 866, agite, facitote sonitus appareat.

f) With -*dum:* Cas. 523, facitodum colas; H. T. 550, facitodum eadem memineris.

g) With *proin, proinde:* Eun. 106, proin tu, tacere si vis, vera dicito; Phor. 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas.

h) With *quin:* Eun. 902, quin tu me servato; Ad. 533, quin otiosus esto.

i) With *modo:* Amph. 520, muttito modo; As. 240, modo adferto; Men. 334, observato modo; Ad. 845, modo facito ut illam serves.

Except in the language of laws the 3d singular future imperative is rare. This may reflect Indo-European conditions, for in the Vedas the 3d singular imperative is likewise rare; see Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 360. Instances of the 3d singular are: Asin. 801, si dixerit, haec multa esto; Curc. 470; 472, damnosos maritos sub basilica quaerito; Men. 51, si quis quid curari sibi velit, audacter imperato et dicito; Most. 773; 1164, immo me praesente amato, bibito, facito quod lubet; Poen. 211; Pseud. 950; Phor. 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas; 1027, qui volet, lacessito. The only instance of the 3d plural is Poen. 1281, tum profecto me sibi habento scurrae ludificatui.

A solitary instance of an imperative in a relative clause occurs in H. T. 577, quod illum facere credito.

Function.

Future used referring to the present. In a few instances (mostly standing formulas) the future imperative is used without apparent reference to future time.[1] Thus *salveto* (not in Terence) often occurs (especially in reply to a previous *salve*; Havet, Wölfflin's Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, x, p. 287 ff.) as the equivalent of *salve*, e.g. Curc. 234, salve : : salveto; so Merc. 283; Rud. 416; As. 296; Pers. 789; Men. 1076, tu salveto, tu vale; Rud. 103, pater salveto : : salvo' sis. So often *facito*, e.g. Bacch. 1153, facito ut facias; Cist. 62; 64, facito ut scias; Men. 866, agite, facitote sonitus ungularum appareat; Merc. 565, facito ut cogites; so also Most. 216; Stich. 519; Ad. 500;

[1] So also in the Vedas. The usage may have been Indo-European; Delbrück, Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 360.

M. G. 354, facito ut memineris; so also Pers. 500; Stich. 47; Pers. 388, facito ut veniat in mentem tibi. Similarly *cogitato* (= *cogita*), e.g. Capt. 711; M. G. 915; Eun. 759; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; and often. Loch, p. 10, suggests that this may be on prosodic grounds. Other examples are: Bacch. 992, animum advortito igitur; so Acc. 485; Amph. 507, observatote quam blande palpabitur; Men. 334, observato modo; Aul. 56; Bacch. 741, plane adscribito; cf. 745, adscribedum, which is not different from *adscribito;* M. G. 1029; 1034; 1217; Pers. 154; Poen. 1320, si quid per iocum dixi, nolito in serium convertere; Bacch. 75, simulato me amare; Aul. 788, "ita di faxint," inquito; Men. 51, si quis quid curari sibi velit, audacter imperato et dicito; Phor. 166, depecisci morte cupio; tu conicito cetera; 423, omnia illum putato dicere; Lucil. 582, coicito te intro ac bono animo es; Liv. And. Od. 6, mihi narrato omnia; C. Gracchus (Meyer, p. 229), si ulla meretrix domum meam intravit, nequissimum me existimatote; Enn. Trag. 355, extemplo me necato et filiam. This is the only instance I have noted where the future imperative is used accompanied by an adverb denoting the immediate present, unless the imperative is joined to a subordinate clause in the future or future perfect indicative; see above, p. 354 f.

The only imperative of *scire* is *scito*, with the force of the present, e.g. Eun. 877; Hec. 67; Cato, Agr. 1, 6; and frequently. M. G. 282 the MSS. read *scis*, for which Bentley, followed by Lindsay, reads *sci;* others read *scias*. Like *scito* is *memento*, e.g. Merc. 282, hoc memento and frequently. Doubled in Cas. 737, memento, memento.

Logical force of the future imperative. In its logical value the future imperative covers substantially the same field of meaning as the present. Thus it is used to convey, —

a) Commands, e.g. Amph. 501, quod erit natum, tollito; As. 375, patitor, quom ego te referiam; Aul. 94, aquam aufugisse dicito; Rud. 813, si appellabit quempiam, vos respondetote; Eun. 768, si vim faciet, in ius ducito; Enn. Trag. 301, sin fracebunt condiciones, repudiato et reddito; Titin. 169.

b) Requests, e.g. As. 939, de palla memento, amabo; Capt. 432, te, quaeso, cogitato mea fide mitti domum; Men. 350, adservatote haec sultis; Poen. 144, postid mihi ignoscito; Liv. And. Od. 6, tuque

mihi omnia narrato; Ad. 281, obsecro te hercle, hominem istum quam primum absolvitote.

c) Advice, e.g. H. T. 972, si displicebit vita, istoc utitor; Eun. 445, par pro pari referto; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, quom cogitabis, sic in animo habeto; 1, 4, ad villam quom venies, videto.

d) Probably the commonest single use of the future imperative is in laws and in general directions for procedure. This use is peculiar to the future and is not shared by the present. Examples: Leges Regiae, Festus, 189, dis piaculum dato; Gell. iv, 3, 3, si tangit, Iunoni agnum caedito; Livy, i, 26, si provocarit, provocatione certato; si vincent, caput obnubito, infelici arbori suspendito, verberato vel intra pomerium vel extra; XII Tab. 1, si in ius vocat, ito; 8, patronus si clienti fraudem fecerit, sacer esto; and frequently in the XII Tab.; CIL, i, 197, 10, 11, facito ioudicetur; i, 202, 21, praeconem legunto; i, 198, 57, facito det; 58, quaestor accipito et habeto; i, 200, 28, eas faciunto pateant; especially frequent in the directions for farming given in Cato's de Agricultura, e.g. 4, villam pro copia aedificato; 5, 6, boves maxima diligentia habeto; 5, 7, scabiem caveto; frondem legito, eam substernito; 23, 2, uvas miscellas legito; 2, marmor si indes, in culleum libram indito; id indito in urnam, misceto cum musto; 3, resinam si indes, bene comminuito. Many chapters fairly bristle with future imperatives.

e) So too in proverbs and rules for conduct, e.g. Trin. 295, moribus vivito antiquis; 323, benefacta benefactis aliis pertegito; Curc. 28, ita tuom conferto amare semper; semper curato ne sis intestabilis; Cas. 210, semper huic verbo vitato; Pseud. 301, eme die caeca hercle olivom; id vendito oculata die; Ad. 417, hoc facito; hoc fugito.

f) Contracts, e.g. Poen. 1157, pactam rem habeto; Pers. 667, habeto.

g) Wishes, e.g. Capt. 452, bene ambulato; Merc. 327; Pers. 50. So also frequently *salveto*; see above, p. 358. Here belongs the expression, macte esto virtute, e.g. Pacuv. 146; Lucil. 143. Baehrens, Frag. p. 34, terra pestem teneto, salus hic maneto.

h) Prayers, e.g. Cato, Agr. 132, 1; 2; Iuppiter, macte hac illace dape pollucenda esto, 134; 139; 141.

i) Challenges and Defiance, e.g. Phor. 1027, qui volet, lacessito; Men. 629, post me derideto.

j) Curses, Curc. 622, te Iuppiter male perdat; intestatus vivito;
Ps. 1229, si mihi argentum dederis, te suspendito.

k) Invitations, e.g. Rud. 1417, hic hodie cenato.

l) Protases, e.g. Curc. 138, tu me curato ne sitiam; ego tibi quod
amas adducam; Merc 140, calidam picem bibito; aegritudo apscesse-
rit; cf. also Amph. 520, muttito modo. Rud. 729, occipito illis
adferre vim; te ego hinc ornatum amittam te ut non noveris; Cato,
Agr. 157, 4, brassicam opponito; cito sanum faciet; bis in die oppo-
nito; dolores auferet; 157, 10; 16.

m) Proviso, As. 240, modo tecum argentum adferto, facile patiar
cetera. This is entirely equivalent to *modo adferas*, etc.

n) Concession, e.g. H. T. 572, esto, 'granted,' 'very well'; so
Lucil. 771.

o) Permission (Wölfflin, Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, x, p. 130).
This category is especially prominent. Examples: XII Tab. 1, ni
it, igitur em capito; 3, in ius ducito; ni iudicatum facit, secum
ducito; si volet maiore vincito; si volet, suo vivito; si volet, plus
dato; As. 165, solus ductato, si dabis; 239; ut tibi lubebit, nobis
legem imponito; Amph. 439, ubi ego Sosia nolim esse, tu esto sane
Sosia; Capt. 896, nisi mantiscinatus probe ero, fusti pectito; Cas.
309, in furnum condito atque ibi torreto me; Cist. 111, si quid tibi
opus erit, promito; Epid. 595, ubi voles pater esse, ibi esto; Men.
727, mea quidem hercle causa vidua vivito; 1029, mea quidem causa
liber esto; M. G. 21, periuriorem hoc hominem si quis viderit, me
sibi habeto; Most. 773, de exemplo meo ipse aedificato; 1164,
amato, bibito, facito quod lubet; Pseud. 123, de istac re in oculum
utrumvis conquiescito; 258; 513, at si non abstuleris? :: virgis cae-
dito; 950; 1075; Trin. 266, apage te sis, Amor; tuas res tibi habeto;
570; And. 863, si invenies me mentitum, occidito; Phor. 143, ubi
abiero, vel occidito; 668, sescentas proinde scribito iam mihi dicas;
984; H. T. 865, si voles, desponsam esse dicito; Eun. 596, si voles,
lavato; 853; 1056, hoc si effeceris, quodvis donum a me optato;
1067; Ad. 970, liber esto.

According to Delbrück, the same usage occurs also in Sanskrit
and Greek; Vergl. Synt. ii, p. 358.

NEGATIVE USES OF THE IMPERATIVE.

PRESENT TENSE.

Ne **with the present imperative** (a construction that has grown up on Latin soil; see p. 348) is fairly common in Early Latin (66 instances in Plautus; see Loch, p. 21; and 14 in Terence; Stahl, p. 38). Examples: Amph. 530, ne corrumpe oculos; 674, ne time; so also, 1064; Cas. 835; Curc. 520; Men. 136; Merc. 173; 891; 1004; M. G. 1346; Pseud. 922; Rud. 688; 1049; Trin. 1181; Amph. 1110, ne pave; so also Merc. 885; M. G. 895; Pseud. 103; As. 462, ne formida; so also 638; M. G. 893; 1011; Capt. 554, ne verere; Amph. 803, ne interpella; 810; 813; Truc. 896; As. 377, ne nega; so also 922; Bacch. 566; Stich. 715; As. 665, ne nos diiunge; 826, ne mone; Aul. 434, ne doce; Pers. 677; Bacch. 733, ne interturba; 833, ne crepa; Capt. 139, ne fle; Epid. 601; M. G. 1324; Cist. 751, ne obloquere; Merc. 501, ne plora; so Pseud. 1038; Poen. 1192, ne lacruma; so Stich. 20; Merc. 614, animum ne desponde; M. G. 215, ne somno stude; 1220, ne parce; Most. 641, ne me roga; 955, ne molestu's; so Rud. 1254; Most. 1105, ne nugare; Pers. 227, ne me attrecta; 490, abi, ne iura; Poen. 261, ne obturba ac tace; 543, ne date; 1229, ne moramini; Pseud. 734, ne quaere; Trin. 361, ne opprobra; 926, ne male loquere; Truc. 366, ne abi; And. 384, ne nega; 543, ne obsecra; 868, ne saevi; H. T. 84, ne lacruma; 85, ne retice, ne verere; 89, ne labora; 564, ne nega; 975, ne te admisce; Phor. 664, ne clama; 803, ne nega; Ad. 279, ne time; 802, ne cura meum.

Most of the foregoing, it will be noted, are short expressions with a tendency to become formulaic, as *ne time, ne pave, ne verere, ne nega, ne fle, ne lacruma, ne plora.* Outside of such expressions the usage had little vogue.

Ne **with the present imperative accompanied by reinforcing words.** There are few instances of this kind. I have noted only Curc. 137, ne plora, amabo; Merc. 321, ne sis me obiurga; Pers. 656, ne sis plora; H. T. 1052, age quaeso, ne offirma te; Eun. 95, ne crucia te, obsecro; Acc. 95, ne retice, obsecro.

Noli, Nolite, with the Infinitive.

Of this there are 19 examples in Plautus (Loch, p. 23), 7 in Terence (Stahl, p. 43), and 9 in other Early Latin writers.

a) With *noli:* Amph. 540, noli, amabo, irasci Sosiae; Frag. xvii, noli precari; As. 417, quaeso hercle noli hunc verberare; Capt. 840, noli irascier; Cas. 204, noli sis illic advorsari; 387, noli uxori credere; Cist. 58, noli, obsecro, imperare; Curc. 197, noli, amabo, verberare lapidem; 697, frater, obsecro te, noli hunc condemnatum perdere; Merc. 934, noli istuc, quaeso, dicere; M. G. 372, noli minitari; 1129, noli stare; Most. 813, noli facere mentionem ted emisse; Pers. 622, noli flere; Poen. 370, noli, amabo, suscensere ero meo; 872, noli (nolito, *P*) edepol devellisse; 1129, mirari noli neque contemplarier; Trin. 627, noli avorsari; Truc. 674, noli metuere; And. 385, suadere noli; 685, noli te macerare; Phor. 556, noli metuere; Hec. 316, noli fabularier; 467, noli fodere; 654, redduce ac noli advorsari; Com. Incert. 87, noli rogare; Afran. 310, noli cum patre coicere (*nolim,* MSS; *noli,* Mercer); 321, noli credere; Lucil. 401, reprehendere noli; Cato (Jord.) 37, 6, noli noli peribere; further, *noli* without inf.: Amph. 520, ah noli! Curc. 131a; Ad. 781, noli, inquam; Hec. 109, noli.

b) With *nolite* (not in Plautus), Enn. Ann. 142, nolite morari; Cato (Jord.) p. 67, 4, nolite habere; Crassus (Meyer, p. 263), nolite sinere; so Hec. 46; Enn. Trag. 303, nolite ad me adire.

An examination of the foregoing material shows that as compared with expressions of the type: *ne time,* the tendency is much less towards restriction to formulaic expressions.

As regards the logical value of both types (*ne fle; noli flere*), it should be noted that, while ordinarily styled 'prohibitions,' their force is less frequently that of peremptory commands than of requests, advice, or encouragement.

Future Tense.

In Early Latin *ne* with the future imperative is not found except in laws and the de Agr. of Cato, the diction of which imitates the legal style throughout. Examples: Lex Numae (Pliny, N. H. xiv, 12), vino rogum ne respergito; Lex Numae (Gell. iv, 3), paelex asam

Iunonis ne tacito (= *tangito*); Ver Sacrum (Livy, xxii, 10), ne fraus esto . . . ne populo scelus esto; Lex Numae (Fest. p. 178, M), ne supra genua tollito; XII Tab. 6, (Fest. p. 364 M), tignum iunctum aedibus vineave ne solvito; XII Tab. 10, (Cic. de Leg. ii, 23), hoc plus ne facito; rogum ascia ne polito; XII Tab. 10, (Cic. ii, 24), homini mortuo ne ossa legito; old proverb (Fest. p. 4, M), ne pomum ex alieno legito in armum; Cato, de Agr. 33, 3, ne serito; 144, 1, ne stringito; 144, 3, ne deportato; 145, 2, ne tangito; 145, 3, socium ne quem habeto; 146, 2, ne quid deportato; probably also in 49, 1, binas gemmas ne amplius relinquito, though some interpret the *ne* here as belonging exclusively with *amplius;* cf. 43, 2, vitibus et sulcos et propagines ne minus pedes IIS quoquo versus facito, where *ne* certainly goes with *pedes IIS.* In the following we find the form *ni, nei:* CIL, i, 197, 6, nei sinito; i, 199, 30, ni quis posideto; ibid. 36, vectigal invitei dare nei debento; i, 198, 69, quaestor moram nei facito; ibid. 71, quom (= *cum*) eis hace lege actio nei esto; i, 577, II, 1, disponito ni plus.

In the following, XII Tab. (Gell. xx, 1, 24), si nolet, arceram ne sternito, we have the only instance that I have noted of a negative permissive imperative, 'he need not spread, unless he chooses.' Blase, therefore, is in error when, Hist. Gramm. der Lat. Spr. iii, p. 249, Anm. 1, he asserts that the permissive use does not occur with negative imperatives.

Connecting Negatives with the Imperative.

These occur almost exclusively in connection with the future imperative.

1. **Present:** Only Stich. 20, ne lacruma neu tuo id amimo fac.
2. **Future.**

a) *Neve, neu, neive, nive,* Merc. 1021, neu quisquam posthac prohibeto; CIL, i, 197, 20, magistratum nei petito neive gerito, neive habeto . . . ni quis sinito neve eum censor in senatum legito; i, 199, 32, is eum agrum nei habeto nive fruimino; ibid. 34, niquis prohibeto, nive quis vim facito, neive prohibeto quo minus; i, 198, 28, neive equom adimito neive quid ob eam rem fraudi esto; ibid. 71, avocarier iubeto neive abducito neive abducier iubeto neive facito; i, 200, 9, neive quis facito; i. 577, II, 21; Eph. Epigr. ii, 198, ne

quis fundatid, neve cadaver proiecitad neve parentatid; Cato, Agr.
144, 1, oleam ne stringito neve verberato; XII Tab. (Cic. de Leg.
ii, 23), hominem mortuom in urbe ne sepelito neve urito; ibid.
mulieres genas ne radunto neve lessum funeris ergo habento; 24,
neve aurum addito.

b) *Neque*, Ver Sacrum (Livy, xxii, 10), profanum esto neque scelus
esto; CIL, xi, 4766, honce loucom nequis violatod neque exvehito,
neque exferto quod louci siet neque cedito; Cato, Agr. 145, oleum ne
tangito utendi causa neque furandi causa; Poen. 1129, mirari noli
neque me contemplarier; Appius Claudius (Baehrens), 2, amicum
quom vides, obliviscere miserias; inimicus si es commentus, nec
libens aeque.

Nolito with the Infinitive.

Nolito with the infinitive is rare. I have noted only the following
examples in the entire range of Early Latin: Cist. 108, nolito acriter
eum inclamare; Poen. 1321, nolito in serium convortere; Cato, Agr.
64, 1, nolito credere; 112, 1, nolito implere; 113, 2; 156, 6, nolito
dare; Lucil. 722, nolito putare. In Poen. 872, the *P* MSS, read
nolito, accepted by Lindsay.

CHAPTER VII.

THE INFINITIVE.[1]

The forms of the Latin infinitive are by origin partly dative (*amari, moneri, regi*), partly locative (*esse, amare, audire*, etc.). But in Indo-European, owing to the relationship of the dative and locative, the dative function attached itself also to the locative formations, so that all infinitives possessed the general notion of direction. From this force there developed in Indo-European the infinitive of purpose, the infinitive as object of auxiliary verbs, the predicative use ('this pasture is not to rob;' i.e. to be robbed), and the infinitive in commands, as seen especially in Homer. See Delbrück, op. cit. p. 453; Brugmann, op. cit. p. 603.

Of these four Indo-European types of usage the Latin has inherited with certainty the first two. Concerning the possible presence in Latin of the infinitive in commands, see below under the Historical Infinitive. New uses of the infinitive, developed in the special history of the Latin itself, are the free use of the infinitive both with and without subject accusative as subject and object of verbs; also the restricted use of the infinitive as appositive and predicate. The origin of the infinitive without subject accusative as object is to be sought in such expressions as *propero ire; facere paro; facere occipio,* etc. Here the infinitive was originally one of purpose, but the connection of ideas naturally led to the feeling that the infinitive was the object, and thus paved the way for the freest use of the infinitive as object with a great variety of verbs.

The origin of the infinitive with subject accusative is probably to be sought in expressions like *me cogis ire; me subigis fateri; te iubeo scribere; cupio filiam desponderi.* From being the object of the main

[1] Walder, Der Infinitiv bei Plautus, 1874; Votsch, De infinitivi usu Plautino, 1874; Bartsch, De infinitivo apud scaenicos poetas Latinos usu, 1882; Reinkens, Ueber den Accusativus cum infinitivo bei Plautus und Terentius, 1886; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 419 ff.; Delbrück, Vgl. Syntax, ii, p. 440 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 603 ff.

verb, the accusative came to be felt as associated with the infinitive, and so led to the free use of the accusative as subject of the infinitive with a multitude of verbs of diverse meanings.

It seems natural to believe that the use of the infinitive as subject (whether with or without subject accusative) is later than its use as object.

The following classification of infinitive uses is based primarily on the presence or absence of subject accusative. Under each of these heads are grouped the various constructions of the infinitive as object, subject, appositive, and predicate. The infinitive of purpose, the infinitive in exclamations, and the historical infinitive will receive separate treatment.

THE INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE.

As Object.

The infinitive with subject accusative is used with a large variety of verbs. Following a familiar and much used method of grouping, I have arranged these under the heads of Verba Declarandi; Verba Sentiendi; Verba Affectuum; Verba Voluntatis.

Verba Declarandi.

adfirmo: Pers. 140, numquam prius edes quam te hoc facturum adfirmas.

adiuro (6): Present: Men. 1025, per Iovem adiuro med erum tuom non esse; 656; Present with future force: Cist. 583, se adiurat mihi monstrare; Future: And. 694, adiuro numquam eam me deserturum; Perfect: Cist. 569, se eam peperisse adiurabat; Men. 616.

adnuo: Enn. Ann. 87, adnuit sese mecum decernere ferro, with future force.

adsimulo (13): Amph. 999, adsimulabo me esse ebrium; Asin. 581; Capt. 1007; And. 735, venire me adsimulabo; H. T. 333.

aio (over 200 instances): Present: Amph. 759, me advenire nunc primum aio; Merc. 296; And. 833, illam civem esse aiunt; Present with fut. force: Capt. 586, quod redimere se ait; Perfect: Capt. 979, gnatum meum tuo patri ait se vendidisse; H. T. 924, quod me

fecisse aiebas; Future (unusual): Men. 1043, ait se allaturum mar-
suppium; Truc. 204.

arguo (5): Perfect only: Amph. 1003, eum fecisse ille arguet
quae ego fecero; Men. 814; M. G. 244; 337; 389.

autumo (16): Present: Bacch. 822, tun me odium esse autumas?
Capt. 885; Present with fut. force: Most. 1132, quian me pro te ire
ad cenam autumo? Perfect: Men. 8, omnis res gestas esse Athenis
autumant; Pseud. 985; Atta, 6; Lucil. 562.

clamito: Aul. 818, quod pueri clamitant in faba se repperisse;
And. 813.

commemoro: Epid. 171, eam qua ex commemores hanc filiam
prognatam; Trin. 951.

comminiscor: Ad. 657, commenta mater est esse puerum natum.

confingo: Merc. Arg. 4, confingit servos emptam matri pedisequam.

confiteor: Present: H. T. 338, habeo aliud quod confiteamini sine
periclo esse; Perfect: And. 607; Aul. 763, quam confessus mihi te
abstulisse; Trin. 184.

convinco: H. T. 1017, metuis ne non convincas esse illum tuom?

deblatero: Aul. 268, deblateravisti vicinis omnibus meae me filiae
daturum dotem.

declaro: Pseud. 682, hominem catum eum esse declaramus.

dedico: Acc. 78, te esse Alcimeonis fratrem dedicat.

deiero: Rud. 1336, deiera te mihi argentum daturum.

delico: M. G. 844, ut tu ipse me dixisse delices.

denego: Stich. 558, denegarit dare se granum tritici (the present
here has future force); And. 241, denegarat se commissurum mihi.

dico (several hundred instances): Present: Men. 331, dicam te
hic adstare Erotio; Present with fut. force: Asin. 366, dixit sese
operam dare; Cas. 479, se locum dixit dare; Merc. 419; And. 411;
Perfect: Merc. 401, neu te advexisse dixeris; H. T. 304, dicimus
redisse te; Future: Amph. 919, testem quem te adducturum dixeras;
Asin. 356; H. T. 500, dixeram operam daturum me.

dictito: H. T. 23, dictitat repente ad studium hunc se adplicasse
musicum; Phor. 4; 743.

dissimulo: Most. 1071, dissimulabo me horum quicquam scire;
Poen. 113.

edoceo: Pacuv. 374, id magis veri simile esse usus edocet.

enuntio: Poen. 888, ut ne enuntiet id esse facinus ex te ortum.

epistulam remisit: Truc. 397, remisit ad me epistulam sese experturum.

exclamo: Eun. 23, exclamat furem, non poetam, fabulam dedisse.

excuso: Aul. 749, excusemus ebrios nos fecisse amoris causa.

exiuro: Amph. fr. vii, exiuravisti te mihi dixe per iocum.

exprobro: Capt. 591, pergin servom me exprobrare esse?

expostulo: M. G. 697, opstetrix expostulavit mecum parum missum sibi.

expurigo: Capt. 620, me expurigare volo me insaniam neque tenere neque mi esse ullum morbum.

facio: H. T. 31, qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via decesse populum; Lucil. 727, purpuream uvam facit albam pampinum habere.

fateor (24): Present: Asin. 62, fateor eam esse importunam; And. 896, me amare hanc fateor; Perfect: Aul. 794, me iniuriam fecisse fateor; Hec. 828, se fatetur nescio quam compressisse.

fidem do: Cist. 236, do (fidem) non facturum esse me; M. G. 453; 455; Rud. 953; Hec. 112, si mihi fidem das te tacituram.

hariolor: Asin. 316, hariolari sibi esse in mundo malum.

indico: Merc. 352, illam me emisse indico; Hec. 395, quod te scire ipsa indicat res; Ad. 338; Eun. 53.

insimulo: Amph. 902, nisi hoc falso dici insimulaturus es.

intendo: Eun. 525, hanc se intendit esse.

interminor: Present: Pseud. 776, interminatust eum cras perbitere, with fut. force; Future: Asin. 363, interminatust nos futuros ulmeos.

interpello: Merc. 201, interpello matri te ancillam tuae emisse.

itero: Turp. 140, festum esse hice quartum diem hodie iterant.

iuro (9): Present: Amph. 435, iuro med esse neque me falsum dicere; 436; Present with fut. force: Pers. 401, iuratust sese hodie argentum dare; Future: M. G. 1411, iura te non nociturum nemini; 1414; Ad. 332, iurabat se unum numquam victurum diem; 473; Perfect: CIL, i, 198, 18, iurato sese eos ex hac lege legisse.

ius iurandum do: Present: Amph. 931, ius iurandum dabo me meam pudicam esse uxorem arbitrarier; Hec. 697, dabo ius iurandum nil esse istorum mihi; Ad. 166; Perfect: Most. 1084, ius iurandum pollicitust dare se, neque se hasce aedes vendidisse; Poen. 1394; Future: Bacch. 1028, ius iurandum dedi daturum id me.

laudo: Cato, fr. (Jord.) 33, 9, laudant me id comparavisse.

mentionem facio: Most. 813, noli facere mentionem ted emisse.

memoro (13): Present: Bacch. 1096, miles memorat meretricem esse eam; Enn. Ann. 114; Perfect: Capt. 577, tune te gnatum memoras liberum?

minor: Asin. 604, minatur se abire, with fut. force; H. T. 489, abiturum se esse minabitur.

minitor: Asin. 611, minitaris te vitam esse amissurum; Amph. Frag. xi.

narro: Present: H. T. 192, quid narrat? :: se miserum esse; 711; Phor. 366; Perfect: Amph. 467, narrabit servom sese amovisse; Rud. 64; Hec. 145; Future: Asin. 367, narra ut acturi sumus: te futurum esse atriensem.

nego (42): Present: Amph. 434, tu negas med esse? And. 612, negabon velle me? Perfect: Amph. 758, te abisse negas? 760; H. T. 18, id esse factum hic non negat; Future: Cas. 323, negavi ipsi me concessurum Iovi; And. 148, ut se filiam neget daturum; 405.

nuntio (14): Present: Merc. 279, nunties negotium mihi esse in urbe; Trin. 773; Perfect: Pseud. 1198, nunties abduxisse alium praedam; Hec. 314, me venisse nuntia; Future: Phor. 777, nuntia hanc venturam.

nuntius: Men. 37, rediit nuntius puerum surruptum patremque esse emortuom.

obiecto: Most. 810, cave illi obiectes te has emisse!

obicio: Epid. 664, neque obiciet mihi pedibus sese provocatum; Lucil. 294, Scipiadae magno obiciebat lustrum illo censore malum fuisse.

ostendo: Present: H. T. 438, si te leni esse animo ostenderis; 933; Phor. 597; Ad. 124; 142; 364; 986; Perfect: Acc. 17, me non peccasse ostendam.

perhibeo: Pacuv. 366, Fortunam insanam esse perhibent philosophi.

pernego: Eun. 34, eas factas prius Latinas scisse sese, id pernegat.

polliceor: Bacch. 742, id pollicetur se daturum aurum; Most. 1084, ius iurandum pollicitust dare se, with fut. force; Hec. 679, pollicitast se concessuram ex aedibus.

pono ('I assume'): Phor. 630, pono esse victum eum.

portendo: Acc. Praet. 35, commutationem rerum portendit fore perpropinquam.

praedĭco (22): Present: Amph. 359, me esse familiarem praedico; Perfect: Amph. 730, cur praedicas te me vidisse? Phor. 725, ne se eiectam praedicet; Afran. 403.

praedīco: Pacuv. 138, hoc est quod fore praedixit.

praesagio: Aul. 178, praesagibat mi animus frustra me ire.

proco: Liv. And. Trag. 13, parere vos maiestas mea procat.

profiteor: Trag. Incert. 52, quem ego me profiteor esse.

promitto: Present with fut. force: Bacch. 969a, quos dare se promisit; Merc. 631; Rud. 540; Future: Aul. 219, promitte hoc fore; Curc. 709; M. G. 326; Poen. 422; Pseud. 901; Hec. 791; Fut. Pass.: Curc. 490, memento promisisse te argentum redditum iri.

queror: Cist. 504, quod factum queror.

renuntio: Bacch. 157, te esse mortuom renuntiem; H. T. 859, quid nunc renuntiem abs te responsum? And. 508.

repromitto: Asin. 454, repromittam solutam rem futuram.

respondeo: Present: Curc. 334; Merc. 943; M. G. 179; Perfect: Capt. 899, tuom advenisse filium respondeo.

rumor est: And. 185, meum gnatum rumor est amare; Hec. 39, rumor venit datum iri gladiatores.

scribo: Curc. 591, poetam audivi scripsisse mulieres duas peiores esse quam unam; Phor. 6, nusquam insanum scripsit adulesculentulum cervam videre fugere; Asin. 760.

signum: H. T. 298, magnum hoc quoque signumst dominam esse extra noxiam.

simulo (18): Present: Men. 125, se uxori simulat male loqui; And. 472, hanc simulant parere; H. T. 943; Hec. 184; 188; Turp. 84; Perfect: Epid. 373, quae se emptam simulet; Truc. 18.

spondeo: Epid. 8, spondeo me accepturum; Trin. 1162, filiam tuam sponden mi uxorem dari?

testis: Present: Capt. 5, testes estis me verum loqui; Perfect: Amph. 919, testem te huc non venisse; Men. 812; Future: Capt. 426, Iovem testem laudo me infidelem non futurum Philocrati; 428; Pseud. 514.

verba inicio: H. T. 892, iniecisse verba Dromonem scilicet sponsae vestem opus esse.

vinco: Amph. 433, vincon te non esse Sosiam ? Cato, fr. (Jord.) 77, 3, vincam nequissimum et indocile esse genus illorum.

voveo: Curc. 72, me inferre Veneri vovi iaientaculum; 181, Venerin pervigilare te vovisti; both with fut. force.

Verba Sentiendi.

accipio: M. G. 1287, quom multos multa admisse acceperim; And. 397, si te aequo animo ferre accipiet.

adspicio: Merc. 220, aspicit te timidum esse; Hec. 367, postquam me aspexere ancillae advenisse; Enn. Ann. 260, quom aspiciunt hostes accedere.

animum advorto: Phor. 909, id vos velle animum advorteram.

arbitror (61): Present: Amph. 675, me meum officium facere arbitror; And. 60, id arbitror esse utile; Aul. 120; And. 812; 959; Perfect: Rud. 537, iure optumo me elavisse arbitror; Asin. 461; Hec. 839, me fecisse arbitror; Future: Hec. 299, tum matrem me aut uxorem in culpa inventurum arbitror.

audio (57): Present: Amph. 752, audivistin hodie me illi dicere? Cist. 170; And. 474, postquam ante ostium me audivit stare; 858; H. T. 421; Perfect: Bacch. 949, Ulixem audivi fuisse audacem; Curc. 591; Phor. 39, erilem filium duxisse audio uxorem; 575; Future: And. 173, ubi nuptias futuras esse audivit; Pass.: 177, postquam audierat non datum iri filio uxorem suo.

ausculto: Pseud. 523a, satis lubenter te ausculto loqui.

censeo (over 100 instances): Present: Asin. 485, erum nos fugitare censes? Men. 636; 924; Eun. 217, censen posse me perpeti? 720; 1072; Present with fut. force: Aul. 528, aes censet dari; Most. 1005, ne me vocare censeas; Perfect: Aul. 240, ne me thensauros repperisse censeas; Bacch. 342; Phor. 327, quot me censes homines deverberasse? Future: Pers. 415, non mihi censebas copiam argenti fore; Trin. 71.

cerno: Cist. 1, quom ego antehac te amavi et mihi amicam esse crevi; Acc. 289, Amfilocum huc vadere cerno; 499, te cerno vadere; 675; Titin. 50, simul ut pueras hasce suspirare crevi.

cogito: Capt. 432, cogitato hinc mea fide mitti domum te; Aul. 591; Poen. 240; Ad. 32, uxor te amare cogitat; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; 39, 2.

cognosco: Present: Cist. 179, eam cognoscit esse quam com-

presserat; Men. 429; Poen. 1374; Perfect: Hec. 811, cognosse anulum illum gnatae suae fuisse; Epid. Arg. 6.

cognitio facta est: Hec. 831, inde est cognitio facta Philumenam compressam esse.

commemini: Men. 1074, non commeministi te mecum exire ex navi?

comperio(r): And. 90, comperiebam nil ad Pamphilum attinere; 145; 902, dum ne ab hoc me falli comperiar; Hec. 763; Acc. 601.

confido: Future only: Curc. 143, confido parasitum hodie adventurum; Merc. 746; Pers. 286; 627; Poen. 1165; Rud. 633; Trin. 460; H. T. 159, illum salvom adventurum esse confido; Inf. in *-assere:* Aul. 687, istuc confido me impetrassere; Capt. 167, illum confido me reconciliassere.

confidentia: M. G. 229, confidentiast nos inimicos profligare posse; Pseud. 763, confidentiast inimicos me posse perdere.

coniectura: And. Alt. Ex. 18, id ita esse facere coniecturam ex me licet.

conscius: Hec. 392, parturire eam nec gravidam ex te solus consciu's; Ad. 348, conscia mihi sum a me culpam esse hanc procul.

consentio: Aul. Calatinus, Baehrens, p. 37, hunc consentiunt primarium fuisse virum; CIL, i, 31, honc oinom ploirume cosentiont optumo fuise viro.

conspicio: Enn. Ann. 55, 20, conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse priora.

conspicor: Present: Bacch. 279, lembum conspicor exornarier; Cas. 40; Curc. 595; Bacch. 669; Perfect: Amph. 1070, illam geminos peperisse conspicor.

credo (over 150 instances): Present: M. G. 1391, omnis se amare credit; Cas. 217; 759; And. 341, quem credo toto me oppido quaerere; 432; Cato, Agr. 64, 1; Perfect: Aul. 815, credo illum anum adiisse; Rud. 397; H. T. 623, ne quid credas me facere esse ausam; Eun. 679, an tu hunc credidisti esse ad nos deductum; Future: Asin. 398, credo eum adfuturum; Rud. 1186; H. T. 591, quid illum porro credas facturum? Eun. 739; Future in *-assere:* M. G. 1128, credo te facile impetrassere.

deputo: Amph. 159, me omnes esse dignum deputent; Phor. 246, omne id deputare esse in lucro; 251; Hec. 477; 799.

diiudico: Amph. 677, quam esse optumam diiudicat.

duco (9): Present: Amph. 839, non illam mihi dotem duco esse; Capt. 436; Most. 125; Pers. 637; Trin. 638; Afran. 324; Perfect: Curc. 513, male dictum id esse duco; H. T. 836, quas pro alimentis esse nunc duco datas; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 233, gloriae sibi ducebat, talentum ob unam fabulam datum esse.

existumo: (11): Present: Capt. 325, non lucrum omne esse utile existumo; Most. 305; 909; Eun. 758, metuo qualem me esse homi-nem existumes; Phor. 369; Hec. 7c; 604; Lucil. 548; Perfect: Stich. 162, minus laboris cepisse illam existumo; Ad. 13, furtumne factum existumetis an locum reprensum.

experior: Stich. 509, te amicum experior esse; Truc. 529, id ita esse experta es; nunc experiere me te amare; Bacch. 387.

falsus sum: Aul. 123, haud falsa sum nos odiosas haberi.

fides, fidem habeo: H. T. 571, mihi fides apud hunc est nil me istius facturum; Eun. 139, si fidem habeat se iri praepositum tibi.

habeo pro, sic habeo: Asin. 628, qui pro cibo habeas te verberari; Cato, Agr. Prooem. sic habuerunt et ita in legibus posiverunt furem dupli condemnari.

indaudio: Capt. 30, indaudivit captum esse equitem Aleum; M. G. 442, hic sororem esse indaudivi; Stich. 77, quasi indaudiverim eas meruisse culpam; Aul. 266.

inspecto: Rud. 1021, inspectavi procul te hunc habere.

intellego (37): Present: Bacch. 344, id mi haud licere intellego; Cas. 11; Cist. 627; And. 500, an tute intellexti hoc adsimulari? H. T. 412; Perfect: Bacch. 390, illum intellego invenisse; Epid. 281; Men. 497; H. T. 843, te intellego resipisse; Future: H. T. 478, si intellexerit prius proditurum te tuam vitam; Pass. Periphr. Rud. 101, villam integundam intellego totam.

invenio: Present: M. G. 1375, eum fidelem esse invenio; Hec. 300, quod quom ita esse invenero; 845; Lucil. 602; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 232; Perfect: Most. 477, id adeo nos nunc factum invenimus; And. 863, si quicquam invenies me mentitum; Hec. 777.

iudico: Cas. 375, optumum istuc esse iudico; Eun. 29, id ita esse iudicare poteritis; Ad. 892.

memini: Present: Cist. 552, mihi memini adferri parvolam puellam; Curc. 651; Epid. 554; 639; Men. 1113; Pseud. 1089;

Asin. 926; Asin. 333; H. T. 626, meministin te maxumo opere
edicere nolle tolli; Phor. 74; Hec. 822; Naev. Trag. 6, auri fonte
lavere me memini manum; Trag. Incert. 193; Enn. Ann. 10, memini
me fiere pavom; Perfect: Curc. 490, memento promisisse te; Aul.
258, illud memineris convenisse.

in memoriam regredior, in memoria habeo: Capt. 1023, in memoriam
regredior audisse me; Poen. 1278, facito in memoria habeas tuam
filiam mihi te despondisse.

nescio: Bacch. 814, nescis nunc venire te; Capt. 29; Eun. 736,
nescibam id dicere illam; Lucil. 22, si me nescire hoc nescis.

nosco, novi: Ad. 862, id esse verum quoivis facilest noscere;
Eun. 778, imperatoris virtutem noveram et vim militum; sine san-
guine hoc non posse fieri.

obliviscor: Merc. 481, satine ut oblitus fui tibi me narravisse;
Truc. 235, qui, quod dedit, id oblitust datum.

opinor (21): Present: Cas. 473, non opinor fieri hoc posse; Epid.
306; Hec. 772, neque has respicere deos opinor; Ad. 648; Perfect:
Hec. 95, haud opinor commode finem statuisse orationi militem; 845;
Future: Pers. 257, neque opinabar neque censebam eam fore mihi
occasionem; And. 387.

opinio est: Cist. 320, hanc eam esse opinio est.

percipio: Asin. 36; 162, magis istuc percipimus lingua dici quam
factis fore; Most. 727; Lucil. 728.

perdisco: Asin. 187, perdidici istaec esse vera.

persentisco: Merc. 687, poterat persentiscere illam esse amicam
tui viri.

praesentio: And. 839, quom me adesse neuter praesenserat.

puto (35): Present: Amph. 284, deos esse tui similis putas; Curc.
511; And. 113, haec putabam esse humani ingeni; H. T. 115, me
putavit plus scire; Cato, Agr. 111; 114, 1; Perfect: Merc. 350,
induci ut putet matri ancillam emptam esse illam; H. T. 842, me
fortunatissumum factum puto esse; Future: Merc. 654, amorem te
hic relicturum putas? Most. 195; Hec. 500, is sibi me supplica-
turum putat?

reor (28): Present: Amph. 656, quos nemo posse superari ratus
est; Aul. 205; Hec. 581, te quod me amare rebar; Perfect: Most.
158, nec quom me melius rear esse deficatam; Acc. 96, tu meam

benevolentiam interisse es ratus ? Future : Hec. 819, uxorem quam numquam est ratus se habiturum.

reperio: Hec. 58, quam paucos reperias fidelis evenire amatores! Ad. 861.

rescisco (9): Present: Merc. 380, non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere; And. 400, puerum ne resciscat mi esse ex illa; H. T. 670; Perfect: Capt. 945, ubi rescivi mihi data esse verba; Merc. 107; Hec. 208, me immerito esse accusatam post rescisces.

scio (over 100 instances): Present: Amph. 510, te sciat operam dare; Men. 251; And. 95, scias posse habere iam ipsum suae vitae modum; 859; Pres. with fut. force; Most. 17, te in pistrinum scis actutum tradier; Cato, Agr. 1, 5; 143, 1; Perfect: Aul. 729, scit peperisse filiam; H. T. 396, me semper scio fecisse sedulo; Future : Pseud. 115, ut me ecfecturum quod promisi scias; H. T. 176, illam hic adfuturum hodie scio; Fut. Passive: Cas. 699, nisi se sciat vilico non datum iri.

scilicet: Curc. 263, item alios deos facturos scilicet; Rud. 395, nunc eam cum navi scilicet abisse pessum in altum; H. T. 359, scilicet facturum me esse; 892.

scisco: Bacch. 302, ut illi id factum sciscerent.

sentio (43): Present: Capt. 140, sensi filio meo te esse amicum; Cas. 58; And. 173, ita Davom modo timere sensi; 196; Perfect: Epid. 92a, ubi senserit sibi data esse verba; Merc. 334; H. T. 860, ne sentiat me sensisse.

somnio: M. G. 392, id me insimulatam falsum esse somniavi; Pers. 257; Ad. 724, tu de psaltria me somnias agere; Enn. Frag. 499 (Baehr.), videbar somniare me esse mortuom.

specto: Amph. 152, spectantibus Iovem et Mercurium facere histrioniam; Rud. 1249, spectavi comicos ad istunc modum sapienter dicta dicere.

spero (30): Present, with fut. force: Rud. 589, itaque alvom prodi speravit nobis salsis poculis; 996; Truc. 936; Eun. 520, sperat se a me avellere; 920; Future: Amph. 718, speravi istam parituram filium; Capt. 780; Cas. 53; Perfect: Capt. 757; And. 407, orationem sperat invenisse se; H. T. 746; Eun. 203.

spes: Capt. 957, ne spem ponas me bonae frugi fore; Epid 332,

spes est fore mecum fortunam; Stich. 22, spes est eum melius fac-
turum; H. T. 981, est spes nos esituros satis; Phor. 691, iniectast
spes patri posse illam extrudi ; Future Pass.: Truc. 886, spes tactuiri
(= *tactum iri*) militem.

spicio : Curc. 155, re spicio nihili meam vos gratiam facere.

suspicor (15) : Present: Aul. 110, me suspicentur habere; Bacch.
61; Merc. 925; Eun. 435, eam me amare suspicatast; Perfect:
Bacch. 683, Bacchidem suspicabar mi male consuluisse; Merc. 254;
H. T. 1014, subditum se suspicatur; Future: Hec. 365, suspicans
morbo me visurum adfectam.

suspĭcio : Bacch. 890, sentio suspicio quae te sollicitet: eum esse
cum illa muliere; Cist. 317, suspiciost eam esse; Pseud. 562, sus-
picio est mi nunc vos suspicarier; Eun. 514, tum erat suspicio dolo
malo haec fieri omnia.

video (over 100 instances): Present: Amph. 41, alios vidi com-
memorare quae bona vobis fecissent; Bacch. 292; And. 363, intro
ire neminem video; Perfect: Cist. 298, video te Amoris tactum
toxico; Poen. 68; St. 411; Trin. 109; Eun. 1015, ubi vestem vidit
illam esse eum indutum; Hec. 680; Future: Trin. 721, video cacu-
lam militarem me futurum.

videlicet: Stich. 555, videlicet parcum fuisse illum senem; 557,
videlicet non fuisse illum nequam adulescentem; Asin. 599.

Verba Affectuum.

admiror: Amph. 89, quid admirati estis Iovem facere histri-
oniam ?

crucior: Capt. 600, crucior lapidem non habere me; H. T. 673

curo : Lucil. 536, coquos non curat caudam insignem esse.

demiror: Cas. 219, coquos demiror eo condimento non utier;
Merc. 698.

discrucior: Bacch. 435, propter me haec nunc meo sodali dici
discrucior.

doleo: Most. Arg. 10, se derisum dolet.

fero graviter: And. 191, graviter sibi dari uxorem ferunt.

ferox est: Asin. 468, ferox est xx minas meas tractare sese.

formido: Bacch. 237, meus formidat animus nostrum tam diu
desidere neque redire filium.

gaudeo (22): Present: Bacch. 185, venire tu me gaudes; 456; Cist. 777; Eun. 976, salvom te advenire gaudeo; Perfect: Cas. 568, quem litem perdidisse gaudeo; Men. 1134; Most. 448; H. T. 816, me istuc ex te prius audisse gaudeo.

gratias ago: Phor. 596, dis gratias agebat tempus sibi dari.

gratulor: Stich. 386, decumam esse adauctam tibi quam vovi gratulor; H. T. 880, desiste deos gratulando obtundere tuam esse inventam gnatam.

gratiam habeo: And. 42, id gratum fuisse advorsum te habeo gratiam.

ira incendor: Hec. 562, incendor ira esse ausam facere haec te.

invideo: Bacch. 543, nullus est quoi non invideant rem secundam optingere.

laetor: H. T. 683, istuc tibi optigisse laetor; Hec. 833.

laetus sum: Naev. Trag. 15, laetus sum laudari me abs te.

maereo: Matius, 1, corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni.

maestus sum: Curc. 336, abeo ab illo maestus med illo frustra advenisse; Most. 796, sed ut maestust sese hasce vendidisse!

miror: Cas. 539, miror huc iam non arcessi uxorem meam; Most. 186; Poen. 233; 1347.

moror (with *nil*): Bacch. 153, nil moror discipulos mi esse iam plenos sanguinis; Cist. 778; Epid. 686; M. G. 447; Poen. 1273; Trin. 337; Acc. 8.

odi: Com. Incert. 95, odi puerulos praecoqui sapientia.

patior (31): Cist. 500, patierin me peiierare? Men. 1010; And. 203, ubivis facilius passus sim me deludier; H. T. 443; Acc. 8; aegre patior: Bacch. 492, viden ut aegre patitur gnatum esse corruptum tuom? Merc. 251; Poen. 1071; Enn. Trag. 91.

pendo nili: Eun. 94, istuc abs te factum nili penderem!

perfero: Most. 1170, aliud quidvis impetrari a me facilius perferam.

perpetior: Capt. 88, nisi qui colaphos perpeti potes frangique aulas in caput; 132; Amph. 887; Asin. 845; Trin. 660; 732; 1165; Eun. 551, nunc est profecto interfici quom perpeti me possum.

rideo: Naev. Com. 120, risi egomet mecum cassabundum ire ebrium.

tolero: Enn. Ann. 91, ferro se caedi quam his dictis toleraret.

vereor: M. G. 1284, ni sciam, verear me hoc ornatu incedere.

voluptatem capio: Afran. 357, voluptatem capio cruciari te.

Verba Voluntatis.

abnuto: Enn. Trag. 306, quid te adiri abnutas?

cogo: Capt. 13, histrionem cogis mendicarier; Epid. 586; Pseud. 150; Hec. 243, ut te cogam quae ego imperem facere; Ad. 652; Lucil. 746, tibi me haec ostendere cogunt; 785.

constituo: Hec. 195, constitui cum quodam hospite me esse illum conventuram; 437.

consuefacio: Ad. 74, consuefacere filium sua sponte recte facere.

cupio (18): Aul. 172, cupio filiam desponderi; Cas. 397, omnis te imitari cupis; Curc. 724; Epid. 77; Most. 61; 301; Poen. 870; Pseud. 448; 468; Most. 349, Iupiter me perisse cupit; H. T. 428, quoius te fieri participem cupis; Hec. 265; Ad. 698; Pacuv. 287, me perbitere cupio.

decerno: And. 238, uxorem decrerat dare se mi hodie; H. T. 147; 940; Hec. 148; 542; Fut.: Hec. 586, ego rus abituram me esse decrevi.

dehortor: Cato, fr. (Jord.) 27, 1, multa me dehortata sunt huc prodire.

desidero: Cas. 423, plura verba ⟨fieri⟩ non desidero; Merc. 148; Stich. 514.

exopto: M. G. 1135, quos videre exoptabam me, exeuntis video.

expeto: Most. 128, nituntur ut alii sibi esse illorum similis expetant; 628, id me scire expeto; Trin. 365; 652; Perfect: Hec. 727, non hoc de nihilost quod me nunc conventam esse expetit; Pacuv. 206, di me esse adiutam expetunt.

gestio: Asin. 788, illam moveri gestio; Phor. 260, ipsum gestio dari mi in conspectum.

impero: Cato, Agr. 141, 1, impera suovetaurilia circumagi.

induco in animum: H. T. 49, eum esse quaestum in animum induxi maxumum; Hec. 292.

induco animum: Trin. 704, id me commissurum ne animum induxeris; CIL, i, 201, 6, ea animum nostrum non indoucebamus ita facta esse; And. 572, si istuc animum induxti esse utile; H. T. 41; Hec. 264; 277; Scipio, Meyer, p. 214; Cato, fr. (Jord.) 42, 9; Passive: Pers. 67, animus induci potest eum esse civem bonum.

iubeo (very frequent): Bacch. 95, argentum iubebo iam intus ecferri foras; Epid. 68; H. T. 585, iube hunc abire aliquo! Hec. 301.

malo (38): Amph. 511, faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis; Asin. 121, moriri sese mavolet; 811, emori me malim; Bacch. 452; 465, illum meum malum promptare malim quam peculium; 490; 519c; 859; 1118, nisi mavoltis fores comminui; Capt. 516, nunc est quom me fuisse quam esse mavelim; Cas. 290; Cist. 766, illius istanc esse malo gratiam; Men. 720; Most. 179, laudari multo malo quam meam speciem alios inridere; Pers. 602, te malo eumpse adire; Poen. 301; 303; Rud. 853; Stich. 80; Truc. 153; 277; 743; Vid. xiii; xv; And. 430, se illam amplecti maluit; 529, quid alias quam hodie has fieri nuptias? H. T. 268; Eun. 66; 762; Phor. 658; Hec. 540; Ad. 311; Enn. Trag. 358, eos reduci quam relinqui malui; Acc. 18; Stat. 49, nisi sese malit pessum dari; Afran. 34; Naev. B. P. 39, sese perire mavolunt. In this construction the subject of the infinitive is more usually the same as that of the governing verb.

moneo: Plaut. Frag. 26, ubi is te monebat ēsse.

nolo (46): Amph. 86, mirari nolim vos; 751; Asin. 386, nolo fores verberarier; 658; 789; Bacch. 99; 1064; Capt. 264; 587; 942, te nolim suscensere; Cist. 83, nolo me meretricem dicier; 232, me nolo fortem perhiberi virum; Curc. 316; Epid. 42; 70; Merc. 420; Most. 176; 194; 287; 332; Pers. 613; 619; Poen. 1005; 1037; 1079, te moneri num nevis? 1267; Pseud. 492; 714; Rud. 619; qui se scelere fieri nolunt nobilis; 1404; Stich. 48; 630; 720; Trin. 281; 685; 979; 1060; Truc. 546; And. 573, nolo tibi ullum commodum in me claudier; H. T. 323; 433; Hec. 348; 593; 758; Ad. 162, hanc iniuriam nolle factam esse (perfect); Stat. 183, tu nurum non vis odiosam tibi esse? In this construction the subject of the infinitive is more usually *not* the same as that of the governing verb.

opto: And. 797, quae sese inhoneste optavit parere ditias; 962, quem ego mihi potissumum optem dari? Enn. Ann. 403, omnes mortales sese laudarier optant; Lucil. 201, ipsum quid facere optes; H. T. 757.

perdoceo: Pseud. 874, quanti istuc unum me coquinare perdoces?

pervolo: Cas. 862, nunc pervelim progrediri senem.

peto: Pseud. 683, quod cupienter dari petimus nobis.

porceo : Lucil. 200, non te porro procedere porcent.

postulo : Amph. 891, fieri quod illaec postulat; Asin. 189, te eam ductare postules; 506; Aul. 361; Capt. 339, ego me amitti non postulo; Cas. 127; 141; 193, postulat vilico suo se dare; Cist. 374; Men. 443; 766, quae viros supservire sibi postulant; 795; M. G. 302, mi nil credi postulo; Poen. 544; Pseud. 378; 438; 853; Rud. 990; Stich. 488; Trin. 237; 1022; Truc. 142; 863; 928; And. 331 postulare id gratiae adponi sibi; 644; H. T. 671; 1011, iniquos es, qui me tacere postules; Eun. 480; Hec. 564; Ad. 200; 879, a meis me amari postulo; Future: Rud. 543, iam postulabas te totam Siciliam devoraturum?

praeopto : Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo ut puerum praeoptares perire.

prohibeo : Epitaph of App. Claudius (Dessau, i, p. 16), pacem fieri cum Pyrrho rege prohibuit; Aul. 435, prohibes nos coquere; Curc. 35, nemo ire quemquam prohibet; Trin. 370; Hec. 266, quae res te facere id prohibet? Acc. 440.

sino (very frequent): Amph. 264, neque hunc hominem sinam accedere; Bacch. 174; Eun. 124; Ad. 97; Lucil. 645.

studeo : Amph. 892, si me illam studeam recipere; Asin. 67, ego me id facere studeo; Stich. 52, neque est quor studeam has nuptias mutarier; And. Alt. Ex. 9; Eun. 1, si quisquamst qui placere se studeat bonis; 313; Phor. 767, dici nos bonos studemus; Hec. 265; Acc. 21, cuiatis stirpem funditus fligi studet; Afran. 197, quem mihi studeo iam dudum dari.

suadeo : Hec. 481, nunc me pietas matris commodum suadet sequi; Phor. 828 is uncertain.

subigo : Lucil. 752, tun me succedere aratro subigas?

tardo : Trag. Incert. 170, illum ut maeror tardaret sequi.

volo (very frequent, —over 250 instances):

a) The subject of the infinitive is the same as that of the governing verb (30): Amph. 662, id se volt experiri; Asin. 183; volt placere sese amicae; 687, exorarier vis ted; Aul. 823; Capt. 920, si sese uti volet; Cas. 287, id velim me scire; Epid. 120, operam Epidici nunc me emere velim; M. G. 678, me volo vivere; Most. 167, volo me placere Philolachi; 218; 856; Pers. 62; 825; Poen. 265, an te vis inter istas vorsarier? 338; 340; Pseud. 167; 329; 1042; 1189,

fricari sese ex antiquo volunt; Rud. 209; Stich. 422, volo me eleu-
theria capere; 701; Trin. 324; Truc. 922, gaudere aliqui me volo;
927; Eun. 248, qui esse primos se omnium rerum volunt; Ad. 504,
si vos voltis perhiberi probos; Pacuv. 23, qui sese adfines esse ad
causandum volunt; Acc. 5, ea me uti volo.

b) The subject of the infinitive is different from that of the
governing verb (200+), e.g. Amph. 5, res rationesque bene expedire
voltis; 8; 13; 593, id volo dici; 769; Asin. 16, vis gnatum superesse;
646, vin erum deludi? Aul. 87, araneas servari volo; 149, volo te
uxorem ducere; Bacch. 58, apud me te esse volo; 76; 93; 530;
Capt. 175, te vocari ad te ad cenam volo; 360; Cas. 281, te volo
mecum loqui; 732, nisi me vis vomere; Cist. 29, nil volunt nos
potesse; 148; 591; Curc. 133, hoc volo scire te; 658; Epid. 114,
quid me vis facere; Men. 51, si quis quid curari sibi velit; Merc. 272,
illunc hircum castrari volo; 776; M. G. 96, volo vos scire; 906;
Most. 100; 628; Pers. 510, hospitium isti praehiberi volo; 515;
Poen. 657, locum sibi velle praeberier; 681; Rud. 33; 183; Stich.
98, quibus voluisti esse nos matres familias; 103; Trin. 9; 39;
Truc. 558, puras esse sibi volt aedis; 840; And. 50, quid facere te
velim; 898; H. T. 164; Eun. 283, num quem evocari hinc vis foras?
979; Phor. 291, num quid me facere voluisti? 305; Hec. 252; 473;
Ad. 399, ut quisque suom volt esse, itast; Acc. 488; Stat. 51; 261;
Turp. 37; 146; Enn. Ann. 143, 4; 345; 391; Lucil. 127; 480;
Scipio, Meyer, p. 214; Cato, Agr. 2, 6; fr. (Jord.) 25, 4.

In a few instances we have the perfect infinitive in this construc-
tion: Amph. 33, iustam rem esse oratam a vobis volo; Cas. 21, vos
omnes opere magno esse oratos volo; Phor. 792, virum me natum
vellem.   In Phor. 792 the perfect denotes prior action; in the
other examples the action looks towards the future, and the force of
the tense does not differ from the present.

In a number of passages sometimes taken as perfect infinitives
with omitted *esse*, we should probably recognize merely predicate
participles.   See under Participles, p. 438.

voto: Asin. 522, te votui compellare; 536; Capt. 703, votuin te
quicquam mi falsum proloqui? Epid. 67a; Men. 848; Merc. 110;
M. G. 830; Poen. 456, votui exta prosicarier; Pseud. 1291; Truc.
641; Afran. 93, votuit me remeare in ludum.

Dependent on the Context.

Often the infinitive with subject accusative is not dependent upon any particular word, but upon the notion of saying or thinking involved in the context, e.g. Epid. 251, adlatae sunt tabellae eum argentum sumpsisse; Merc. 47, iniustitiam lenonum expromere; lacerari valide suam rem; 464, at me incusato: te fecisse sedulo; M. G. 262, non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem participaverit, sese vidisse; M. G. 1184, Philocomasium arcessito . . . nisi eat, te soluturum esse navim; ventum operam dare; Pers. 165, puerum volo mittere . . . med esse ecfecturum; Poen. 771, id nunc his cerebrum uritur, me ccc Philippos facturum lucri; Pseud. 418, sermoni omnibust, eum velle amicam liberare; Truc. 439, ostendit sese medullitus: se mi infidelem numquam fore; Phor. 214, par pari respondeas . . . vi coactum te esse; 598, hominem ad forum iussi opperiri: eo me esse adducturum senem; Ad. 162, quod te purges, hanc iniuriam mihi nolle factam esse; Turp. 136, litteras misi, processe nobis mercaturam.

Infinitive as Object, with Subject Accusative Understood.

With many of the categories enumerated in the preceding pages, the subject accusative is often understood, both when it is the same as the subject of the governing verb, and when it refers to another person or thing. The following are the most important instances of this usage:

abdico: Pacuv. 55, consanguineam esse abdicant.

adiuro: Amph. 889, adiuret nolle esse dicta; Hec. 268, sancte adiurat non posse perdurare; Men. 655.

adnuo: Bacch. 187, ego autem venturum adnuo; Curc. 342.

adsimulo: H. T. 358, istunc exora ut suam esse adsimulet; Hec. 235, qui scis an ea causa me odisse adsimulaverit?

aio: Amph. 387, ego sum ille Sosia quem tu esse aiebas; Capt. 365; And. 353, ait tibi uxorem dare hodie; 450; 470; 688; Merc. 637; H. T. 171; Eun. 315; 513; Phor. 315; 864; Hec. 238; Pacuv. 369, insanam autem esse aiunt.

arbitror: Amph. 908, nihilo magis es, neque ego esse arbitror; Bacch. 1131; Cas. 283; Hec. 215, an, quia ruri esse soleo, nescire arbitramini? Ad. 401.

aspicio: Cas. 228, tristem stare aspicio; Acc. 184, aspicio ex nemore pavidum egredi.

audio: Capt. 602, audin lapidem quaeritare? H. T. 181, huic filium scis esse? :: audivi esse; 731, audisti proxumam esse huic fundo ad dextram?

autumo: H. T. 19, neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat; Pacuv. 118, aut hic est aut hic adfore actutum autumo.

censeo: Asin. 385, nemo tetigit. :: at censebam attigisse; 338; 731; Bacch. 839; 904; Ad. 193, neque vendundam censeo, quae liberast.

cerno: Poen. 101, quia amare cernit.

clamito: And. 144, clamitans, comperisse.

clamo: Bacch. 284, cum mi ipsum nomen clamaret dempturum esse si quid crederem.

cognosco: Aul. 717, nam esse bonum cognosco; Eun. 226, ut non cognoscas eundem esse.

commemini: Curc. 710, non commemini dicere.

comminiscor: Hec. 333, aliquid tulisse comminiscentur mali.

comperio: Phor. 801, cognatam comperi esse nobis; Hec. 779, si compererit crimine falso credidisse.

concriminor: M. G. 242, si concriminatus sit eam vidisse osculari.

confido: Capt. 696, si ille rebitet, sicut confido adfore.

confiteor: Cist. 741, confitemur cistellam habere.

constituo: Eun. 205, is hodie venturum ad me constituit domum; cf. Hec. 195.

credo: Amph. 469, illum mentiri sibi credet, neque credet huc profectum; 129; Bacch. 1129; 1138; Capt. 559; Cas. 271; 355; H. T. 881, ut nil credas intellegere; Eun. 118; 827; 858; Hec. 499; 617; Ad. 359; 518; 750.

cupio: Asin. 83, cupio esse quod det.

deiero: Cas. 670, deieravit occisurum eum; Lucil. 610, deierat non scripsisse et post non scripturum; Eun. 331.

denego: Men. 582, datum denegant quod datum est; H. T. 487, dare denegaris.

dico: Amph. 345, iam faciam ut (sc. *me*) verum dicas dicere; Asin. 806, si forte velle dixerit; Aul. 108; And. 394, dic patri (sc. *te*) velle; H. T. 726, at quom (sc. *me*) venturam dixero; 768;

774; 866; Phor. 627; Hec. 76; 434; 550; Ad. 151; Enn. Frag. 479; Lucil. 22.

diffido: Cato, Agr. 157, 13, quos diffidas sanos facere, facies.

dissimulo: Epid. 238, dissimulabam earum operam sermoni dare.

duco: Hec. 343, qui amat quoi odio est bis facere stulte duco.

edico: H. T. 626, meministin te edicere, si puellam parerem, nolle tolli.

existumo: Amph. 330, vix incedo inanis, ne ire posse cum onere existumes; Ad. 270, coram te laudare, ne id adsentandi facere existumes.

experior: Trin. 460, benigniorem te mihi, quam nunc experior esse, confido fore; Hec. 489, amo et desidero, nam fuisse miro ingenio expertus sum.

expeto: Enn. Trag. 379, quem quisque odit periisse expetit; Pacuv. 206.

fama: Hec. 775, famae (me) solam id fecisse.

fateor: Asin. 566, fateor esse vera; Bacch. 1013; Epid. 703; Rud. 1358; And. 14, in Andriam fatetur transtulisse; Ad. 77.

fingo: Trag. Incert. 247, finge advenam esse.

gaudeo: Epid. 7, venire salvom gaudeo; M. G. 897; Most. 1147; H. T. 407, salvom venisse gaudeo; Hec. 353.

gratiam habeo: Phor. 54, amo te et non neclexisse habeo gratiam.

impero: And. 842, animo otioso (eos) esse impero; Eun. 252, imperavi mihi omnia adsentari; Acc. 385, (milites) signa canere ac tela ob moenia offerre imperant; Trag. Incert. 89, solvere imperat secundo rumore.

induco animum: And. 883, quom ita animum induxisti tuom, quod cuperes aliquo pacto efficiundum tibi.

induco: Amph. 914, periclitatus sum animum tuom quid faceres et quo pacto id ferre induceres (in a different sense from And. 883).

inspecto: Poen. 710, egredere ut inspectes aurum lenoni dare.

intellego: Aul. 648, ut ne (sc. *te*) apstulisse intellegam; Most. 278; Pseud. 459; Vid. 34; And. 517, quom intellexeras id consilium capere; H. T. 979; Hec. 413; 657.

itero: Trin. 832, fidus fuisti; infidum esse iterant; Pacuv. 370, caecam esse iterant.

iubeo: Asin. 526, (eum) accersi iubes; Cist. 592, vir si veniet,

iube opperirier; 618; Epid. 69; Men. 225, cocta sunt; iube ire accubitum; 776; Merc. 777; M. G. 70; 1268; 1278; Most. 377; 420; 752; Pers. 269; 303; 314; 790; St. 248; 607; Truc. 585; And. 464, quod peperisset iussit tolli; 546; 741; 955; H. T. 775, et quidem iubebit posci; 1001; Eun. 262; 836; Phor. 409; 414; Hec. 185; Ad. 416; 429; 925.

iuro: Cist. 98, iuravit (se) me uxorem˙ducturum esse; Poen. 361; Rud. 1379; And. 728, si opus sit iurato mihi non adposisse; Hec. 60; Cato, fr. (Jord.) 77, 6.

ius iurandum: Cato, Agr. 148, 2, ius iurandum dabit verum fecisse.

laetus sum: Eun. 392, ain tu, laetast? :: non tam ipso quidem dono, quam abs te datum esse; Phor. 820.

malo: Eun. 796, Pamphilam huc redde, nisi vi mavis eripi.

memini: Epid. 540b, quam memini comprimere; And. 428, ego illam vidi: virginem forma bona memini videri.

minor: Men. 842, minatur mihi oculos exurere; Stich. 21.

miror: Truc. 204, nondum advenisse admiror; H. T. 1001, miror non continuo abripi iusse.

nego: Cas. 573, si neget (animum) adesse; 583, negavit (se) posse; 698; Cist. 738, negat esse quod det; Epid. 227; Merc. 767; Most. 735; Poen. 105; Pseud. 119; 125; Stich. 256; 367; 393; And. 358, negat vidisse; 379; Phor. 459; 1014.

nolo: Bacch. 914 si non est, nolis esse; 1062; Men. 351; Trin. 979, dum ille ne sis quem ego esse nolo; 1170; H. T. 206, scortari (sc. filios suos) crebro nolunt; 627; Phor. 796.

nuntio: H. T. 892, nam ubi desponsam nuntiasti filio.

nuntius: Merc. 667, quoniam a viro ad me advenit **nuntius rus** non iturum.

obiecto: Merc. 411, mihi obiectent lenocinium facere.

opinor: Bacch. 12, Praenestinum opino esse; ita gloriosus erat; Cas. 858; And. 929, hercle opinor fuisse Phaniam.

opto: Bacch. 724, bellus, atque ut esse optabam, locus.

patior: Acc. 365, pulsum patimini.

percipio: Curc. 159, ne quae hic agimus erus percipiat fieri.

polliceor: Men. 311, nummum illum quem mihi pollicitu's dare; Most. 1086; And. 401, pollicitus sum suscepturum; 613; H. T. 724;

Hec. 751, pollicerer tibi segregatum habuisse a me Pamphilum; Lucil. 213.

postulo: Rud. 941, nil habeo, ne tu mihi esse postules; 393.

praedīco: And. 840, id facturas Davos praedixit mihi.

praedĭco: Acc. 615, ni vestitus, maestitudo praedicarent hominem esse.

prohibeo: H. T. 573, ea facere prohibet tua praesentia; Pacuv. 227, si ire conor, prohibet baetere.

promitto: Bacch. 920, quos dare promisi militi; Asin. 97; 529; 930; Cas. 288, Casinam promisi vilico nostro dare; Cist. 542; Men. 894; Rud. 777; Trin. 5.

puto: Bacch. 121; Curc. 557, quoi homini di sunt propitii ei non esse iratos puto; Poen. 1092; Phor. 21, quod adlatumst sibi esse rellatum putet; 1022.

renuntio: H. T. 661, quid renuntiavit? : : fecisse id quod iusseram.

reor: Capt. 256, quom cavisse ratus est, saepe is cautor captus est; Epid. 485; Acc. 378.

repromitto: Curc. 667, ita repromisit, omne argentum reddere.

respondeo: Amph. 214, respondent se et suos tutari posse.

rumor: H. T. 16, quod rumores distulerunt malivoli, multas contaminasse Graecas.

scio: Amph. 22, scibat (vos) facturos; Cist. 588; Curc. 325; 331; Most. 953; Pers. 118; Stich. 336; And. 402, me obsecravit, qui se sciret non deserturum, ut darem; 976; H. T. 181; Hec. 641; Ad. 402.

scilicet: Asin. 787, scilicet facturam; Pseud. 1179; H. T. 856.

scribo: Eun. 10, scripsit causam dicere prius unde petitur.

sentio: Men. 481, quoniam sentio (eam) errare; Amph. 729; Hec. 638, sensit peperisse.

sino: Amph. 453, hanc nostram adire non sinam; Capt. 114; Cas. 472; Cist. 115; 453; Pers. 318; Poen. 373; 722; Pseud. 861; Hec. 565, edicam servis, ne ecferri sinant; 853; Acc. 365.

spero: Stich. 71, spero ab eo impetrassere; Truc. 734; 753; And. 553, ut sperem posse avelli; 560; Hec. 147; Lucil. 456, deplocassere sperans.

spes: Men. 1102, spes mihi est vos inventurum fratres germanos; Stich. 387.

subigo: Truc. 783, vis subigit verum fateri.

suspicor: M. G. 401, suspicatus es eam vidisse osculantem.

video: Asin. 472, non vides irasci? Capt. 420; Men. 953; Pers. 642; Eun. 603, video esse; Lucil. 795.

videlicet: Asin. 599, esse interdius videlicet Solonem.

vinco: Most. 95, profecto esse vera vincam.

volo: Asin. 12, Asinariam volt esse; Cist. 506, quod dedi datum non vellem; Truc. 118; H. T. 322, vis quod des illi effici; Ad. 969; Com. Incert. 100; Lucil. 145.

voto: Truc. 901, manus votat priusquam penes sese habeat quicquam credere; Most. 869.

Dependent on the context: Trin. 102, te volturium vocant: hostisne an civis comedis parvi pendere; H. T. 605, orat ut det: post daturam.

Aequom censeo Type.

In a number of passages we have an infinitive with subject accusative used as object of a verb, accompanied by *aequom*, or some similar word standing in predicate relation to the object infinitive, e.g.

aequom censeo: Asin. 229, dic quid me aequom censes pro illa tibi dare! Aul. 597; Capt. 301; Epid. 552, tuae memoriae interpretari me aequom censes; Merc. 569, etiamst quod te facere aequom censeo; Trin. 304, meum animum tibi servitutem servire aequom censui; cf. Poen. 794, amicos consulam quo me modo suspendere aequom censeant, where *me* may serve both as subject and object; Cato, fr. Jord. 64, 6, vim in corpus liberum non aequom censuere adferri.

fas existumo: Asin. 514, neque id me facere fas existumo.

acceptum, sanctius, habeo: Most. 247, si acceptum sat habes tibi fore illum amicum sempiternum; Cato, fr. Jord. 59, 7, maiores sanctius habuere defendi pupillos quam clientem non fallere.

Passive Construction of Verbs Taking the Infinitive with Subject Accusative as Object.

A few verbs taking the infinitive with subject accusative in the active are found used personally in the passive with a dependent infinitive ('Nominativus cum Infinitivo'), e.g.

adducor: Afran. 290, adducor ferre humana humanitus.

arguo: Cato, fr. Jord. 24, 5, quod arguatur male facere voluisse.

dico: Asin. 382, ubi dicitur habitare; Men. 10, ubi factum dicitur; Pseud. 870, dicitur ฺfecisse; Rud. 161, Herculis socius esse diceris; Truc. 84, is nunc dicitur venturus peregre; Asin. 313; Cist. 755; Frag. 73; Pacuv. 167, prius data est quam tibi dari dicta (*dico = promitto*); Acc. 530, in quos delatus locos dicitur; 535; Naev. Com. 2, dicitur geminum occidisse; Gracchus, Meyer, p. 230, quin appetisse dicamini; 233; Cato, Agr. 6, 4; fr. Jord. 15, 10.

digno: Acc. 474, cui dignabor dari?

existimo: Cato, Agr. Prooem., amplissime laudari existimabatur.

fero: Acc. 669, quorum genitor fertur esse ops gentibus.

invenio: Poen. 1171, ut haec inveniantur esse huius filiae.

itero: Acc. 3 (Baehrens), quae Cronia esse iterantur.

iubeo: Phor. 416, iussast dari; CIL, i, 198, 63, quo die iusei erant adesse.

monstro: Poen. 959, in hisce habitare monstratust regionibus.

renuntio: And. 499, quasi non tibi renuntiata sint haec sic fore.

perhibeo: Men. 408, qui perhibere natus esse in Sicilia; Pers. 202, nullus esse peior perhibetur; Stich. 25, esse aurei perhibentur; Trin. 692.

reperio: Cas. 1013, haec Casina huius reperietur filia esse.

subigo: Amph. 1143, mea vi subactast facere.

video (frequent): Aul. 803, esse in vado videtur; Amph. 303, iam pridem videtur factum; And. 757, adeon videmur vobis esse idonei in quibus sic inludatis? Eun. 454, audire vocem visa sum militis.

voto: Phor. 864, ait esse votitum accedere.

After the analogy of *dicor* we find *clueo* with the infinitive, e.g. Bacch. 925, Atridae cluent fecisse facinus maxumum; Acc. 533, unde ignis cluet mortalibus divisus; Enn. Praet. 1, esse cluebat miserrimus.

Except with *dicor* and *videor* the construction Nominativus cum Infinitivo is rare; with *videor* it occurs with great frequency, as it does in the classical period.

INFINITIVE (WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE) AS SUBJECT.

The infinitive with subject accusative is used as subject with a large variety of impersonal verbs, and with a few other expressions.

acceptum est: Merc. 655, si id fore ita sat animo acceptum est; Most. 224.

accidit: Amph. 171, quodquomque homini accidit lubere, posse
retur.

adparet: Eun. 486, adparet servom hunc esse domini pauperis.

aegre est: Capt. 129, aegre est mi hunc facere quaestum carcerarium.

aequom est (60): Amph. 851, quid aequomst fieri? Bacch. 29;
398; 524; Capt. 259; Epid. 257, si aequom siet me plus sapere quam
vos; Rud. 715; H. T. 203, huncine erat aequom ex illius more
vivere? Eun. 42; Phor. 673; Hec. 868; Ad. 255; 675; Enn. Trag.
137; Titin. 134; Cato, Jord. 24, 14.

aequius est, videtur: Cas. 265, illum mi aequius est quam me illi
concedere; Men. 1010, me perirest aequius; Merc. 549; M. G. 515;
Rud. 269, aequius vos erat candidatas venire; 322; Stich. 97; 290;
Trin. 119, ei rei operam dare te fuerat aequius; 1040, ubi malos
mores adfigi fuerat aequius; M. G. 517, med expurgare haec tibi
videtur aequius; Trin. 551.

aequissimum est: Rud. 1246, semper cavere hoc sapientis aequis-
sumumst.

aliud est: Cato, Frag. 44, 4, aliud est properare, aliud est festinare.

auditum est: And. 534, ex te auditum qui aibant filiam meam
nubere tuo gnato; with fut. force.

auguratum est: Acc. Praet. 38, auguratum est rem Romanam pub-
licam summam fore.

bene est: Trin. 52, bene est illam valere.

certum est: Merc. 644, certumst ire me; Stich. 141, certumne est
neutram persequi imperium patris? Eun. 704, iam satis certumst
virginem vitiatam esse? Hec. 583, nunc tibi me certumst gratiam
referre; Turp. 180, certum ac deliberatum est me illis obsequi; Enn.
Ann. 143, 7, eorundem libertati me parcere certum est. In the
Eunuchus passage, *certum est* is employed in the unusual sense of
constat.

certa res est: Merc. 857, certa rest me usque quaerere illam.

certissumum est: Men. 1058, certissumumst mepte potius fieri
servom.

clam me est: Hec. 577, non clam me est tibi me esse suspectam.

condecet: Truc. 227, meretricem similem sentis esse condecet.

conducit: Bacch. 764, non conducit huic sycophantiae senem tran-
quillum esse.

consentaneum est: Curc. 165, procul amantem abesse hau consentaneumst.

constat: Lucil. 172, unum concidisse senem constat.

convenit: Bacch. 659, vorsipellem frugi convenit esse hominem; Rud. 703, ignoscere his te convenit; Trin. 681, non convenit me in ditiis esse; H. T. 165, non convenit nunc me ipsum fugere; Eun. 494.

convicium est: Merc. 59, convicium (esse), me annos iam se pascere.

credibile est: Merc. 210, neque credibilest forma eximia mulierem eam me emisse matri.

cruciat: M. G. 617, quid est quod cruciat? :: me tibi facinora puerilia obicere.

curatum est: Bacch. 1067, curatum est esse te senem miserrumum.

decet: In many cases it is impossible to determine with certainty whether we have the infinitive with subject accusative, or whether the accusative depends upon *decet*. The following are the most certain illustrations of the infinitive with subject accusative: Amph. 35, iniusta a iustis impetrari non decet; 267, decet et facta moresque huius habere me similis; Asin. 81, me habere honorem decet; 833; Bacch. 640, hunc hominem decet auro expendi, huic decet statuam statui; Capt. 321, ne patri decere videatur magis me saturum servire; Cas. 230, non decet esse te tam tristem; Cist. 22, decet pol, mea Selenium, hunc esse ordinem benevolentis inter se; Curc. 332; Epid. 443; Men. 453; Poen. 1186; Pseud. 1225; Rud. 407; 702; Stich. 443; Trin. 548; And. 16, disputant contaminari non decere fabulas; H. T. 132; Hec. 252; Naev. Com. 22 ff.

decorum est: Asin. 508, an decorum est advorsari meis te praeceptis? 689; 701.

decretum est: Asin. 73, eos me decretumst persequi mores.

dictum est: And. 796, in hac habitasse platea dictumst Chrysidem.

difficile est: Trin. 620, difficilest reperiri amicum.

dignum est: M. G. 723, huic homini dignumst divitias esse et diu vitam dari; Trin. 1045; H. T. 108, ego quod me in te sit facere dignum invenero.

dispudet: Eun. 832, dispudet sic mihi data esse verba.

dubium est: Hec. 326, perisse me haud dubium est.

evenit: Cist. 309, opportune evenit rediisse Alcesimarchum.

expedit: Afran. 278, ut scire possis ad quo te expediat loqui; Lucil. 543; Cato, Agr. 3, 2.

fallit: H. T. 514, me fefellit hosce id struere.

fas est: H. T. 149, nec fas esse ulla me voluptate frui; Bacch. 1025, nunc si me fas est opsecrare; Acc. 157.

flagitium est: Poen. 965, flagitiumst te pati; Ad. 102, non est flagitium adulescentulum scortari? 112.

fortasse: Epid. 296, xl fortasse eam posse emi minis; Merc. 782; Truc. 680, parasitum te fortasse dicere; Hec. 313, fortasse unum verbum inter eas iram hanc concivisse.

gaudio est: And. Alt. Ex. 13, mihi non minus est gaudio me repperisse.

gratum est: Capt. 414, te meminisse id gratum est mihi.

grave est: And. 566, istuc periculum in filia fieri grave est.

honestum est: Hec. 151, eam ludibrio haberi neque honestum est.

honestius est: Asin. 820, me honestiust hanc rem facere.

humanum est: Hec. 552, nonne ea dissimulare nos magis humanum est?

iniquom est: Scaurus, Meyer, p. 242, est enim iniquom apud alios me rationem vitae reddere.

inscitiast: Eun. 1071, vos non facere inscitiast.

iniurium est: Aul. 699, me illi irasci iniurium est; Hec. 73.

interest: Trin. 130, quid interest dare te in manus argentum amanti homini?

intermissum est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum scorta duci.

ita est: Aul. 688, si ita est, te compressisse virginem.

ius est: Pers. 106, pernam ius est adponi frigidam; Ad. 686.

licet: Cas. 706, redire me ut liceat; 89; Asin. 421; Pers. 291; 774; Pseud. 16; Trin. 21; Truc. 747; H. T. 401; 666, non licet hominem esse saepe ita ut volt; 672; Eun. 550; Hec. 11; 207; Afran. 118; CIL, i, 199, 5, quem agrum eos vendere heredemque sequi licet. The relative infrequency of this construction is in marked contrast with the common use of the infinitive without subject accusative in connection with *licet;* see below, p. 409.

lubet: And. 958, at mihi nunc sic esse hoc verum lubet.

longum est: And. 977, longum est illum me exspectare.

melius est (15): Amph. 664, redire meliust nos; Asin. 249; Curc. 417; Epid. 669; Men. 329; not in Terence.

in mentem est: Bacch. 161, ecquid in mentem est tibi patrem tibi esse?

in mentem venit: Aul. 228, in mentem venit te bovem esse; Bacch. 1193; Pers. 388; Plaut. Frag. 156; Phor. 652.

mirum est; mira videntur: Bacch. 179, mirum est me te quaesere; Cas. 259; M. G. 321; Men. 361, mihi mira videntur te hic stare foris; so Truc. 669.

mirabile est: H. T. 387, vos esse istius modi et nos non esse haud mirabilest.

miseria est: M. G. 68, nimiast miseria nimis pulchrum esse hominem.

miserum est: Epid. 136, miserum est ingratum esse homini id quod facias bene.

miseret: H. T. 750, miseret me tantum devenisse ad eum mali.

molestiae est: Rud. 830, num molestiaest me adire ad illas?

mos est: Capt. 198, servitus si evenit, ei vos morigerari mos bonust; Ad. 532.

necesse (necessus) est: Pseud. 995, necesse est hodie Sicyoni me esse; Truc. 222; And. 372, quasi necessus sit te illam uxorem ducere; Eun. 1075, necessest multum accipere Thaidem; Hec. 304, nescio quid necessest evenisse; Naev. Com. 106.

nefas est: Acc. 280, petere a me id quod nefas sit concedi tibi.

nihil est: Cas. 286, nihil est me cupere factum.

nimium est: Cato, Agr. 57, eos non est nimium in annos singulos vini quadrantalia decem ebibere.

nobile est: Trin. 828, nobilest pauperibus te parcere solitum.

nuntiatum est: Stich. 676, quoniam nuntiatum est istarum venturos viros.

officium: Trin. 174, quid fuit officium meum me facere?

operae pretium est: M. G. 31, ne hercle operae pretium quidemst mihi te narrare.

oportet (102):

a) Following the present. This is the commonest usage (85): Amph. 268, me malum esse oportet atque hunc pellere; Capt. 283, id Orcum scire oportet; Stich. 68, pati nos oportet quod ille faciat;

And. 786, hanc oportet abripi; H. T. 546, te adiutare oportet; Cato, Agr. 2, 7; Amph. 1031, prodigum te fuisse oportet in adulescentia, shows the perfect inf.

b) Following the perfect and imperfect.

1) The infinitive more commonly stands in the perfect, — probably as a result of the desire to emphasize the reference to the past: Amph. 740, te Iovi comprecatam oportuit; Cas. 766, cenam iam esse coctam oportuit; Epid. 11, quam te iam diu perdidisse oportuit; Men. 194, si amabas, iam oportebat nasum abreptum; M. G. 1336, aurem admotam oportuit; Poen. 526, pridie nos te huc duxisse oportuit; Trin. 416; Truc. 510; And. 238, oportuit prae-scisse me; Eun. 981, oportuit rem praenarrasse me; Ad. 214; Stat. 9, gratulatum med oportebat (codd: *me oporteat*).

2) In the following instances we find the present infinitive with *oportuit:* Aul. 180, neque magister quem dividere argentum oportuit; Capt. 294, hic fecit hominem frugi ut facere oportuit; Eun. 1012, credere oportuit te; Phor. 70, regem me esse oportuit; Ad. 672, an sedere oportuit domi virginem? Cato, Agr. 2, 3, centones, cuculiones familiam oportuisse sibi sarcire; 2, 4; CIL, i, 200, 61, quantum numerum hominum in coloniam deduci oportuit licuitve.

optumum est: Turp. 56, quam legere te optumum esset.

opus est: Bacch. 988a, quid me tibi adesse opus est? Capt. 553; Merc. 917, non opus est intro te ire; Pseud. 1255; Stich. 81; 232; Phor. 560, opus est mihi Phormionem adiutorem dari; Hec. 409; Ad. 625; Naev. Sat. 66, quod sciri opus est.

par est: Amph. 832, quam me vereri et metuerest par maxume; Capt. 147; Bacch. 620; Pers. 800; Stich. 512; Trin. 230; Curc. 110b; Hec. 561, aderam quoius consilio par fuerat ea prospici; 739; 867; Acc. 137, magis me par est tibi consulere et parcere.

par videtur: Amph. 493, deum non par videtur facere; 959.

patris est: And. 187, ea me exquirere iniqui patris est.

piaculum est: Truc. 223, piaculumst miserere nos hominum rei male gerentum.

perdoliscit: Acc. 317, nec perdoliscit fligi socios, morte campos contegi.

periculum est: Rud. 144, nullumst periculum te hinc ire inpransum domum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 33, 1.

peropus est: And. 265, nunc peropus est hunc cum ipsa loqui.

placet: Amph. 310, non placet me hoc noctis esse; Hec. 866.

placabilius est: Phor. 961, id nosmet indicare placabilius est; Ad. 608.

praestat: Bacch. 396, impendiosum praestat te quam ingratum dicier.

praestabilius: Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem quam haec ita esse me resciscere.

pravitas est: H. T. 973, quae istast pravitas id obesse huic!

prodest: Afran. 13, quid prodest istuc te blaterare!

prostibuli est: Cist. 331, nam meretricem adstare in via solam prostibuli est.

pulchrum est: Acc. 148, tropaeum ferre me a forti viro pulcrum est.

pudet: Bacch. 1007, pudet prodire me ad te in conspectum; 1155a; Epid. 168, quid est quod pudendum siet, genere gnatam bono ducere te uxorem! H. T. 260, quoius nunc pudet me monuisse frustra neque eum potuisse me aspellere; Hec. 231, cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet? Ad. 690, si te mi ipsum puduit proloqui. Some other passages are taken by certain scholars as belonging under this category, but in these the accusative is best taken as depending directly upon *pudet;* see below, p. 411, and cf. above under *decet,* p. 391.

pudicitiast: Stich. 100, pudicitiast eos nos magnuficare.

rectius est: Ad. 920, multo rectiust quam illam duci per viam.

refert: Bacch. 704, quid mi refert Chrysalo esse nomen? Cas. 529, quid me amare refert? Curc. 555; Epid. 116; 133; M. G. 882; Pseud. 1085; Truc. 394.

renuntiatum est: Aul. 604, eam renuntiatum est dari, with fut. force; Men. 1127.

sat est: Poen. 250, sat est istuc alios dicere nobis; Phor. 724, non satis est tuom te officium fecisse; Enn. Ann. 276, vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri.

satius est: Amph. 176, satius est me queri; 1017; Bacch. 395; Cas. 111; Curc. 266; Epid. 60; Merc. 656; Poen. 552; Trin. 311; Truc. 926; And. 307, quanto satius est te id dare operam! H. T. 969; Eun. 772; Hec. 730, ne quid faciam plus quod post me minus fecisse satius sit (perfect); Ad. 29.

scelus videtur: Merc. 209, scelus videtur me parenti proloqui mendacium.

servile est: Poen. 523, servile (*servuli, C*) esse duco festinantem currere.

spectatum est: Poen. 823, satis spectatum est deos eius neclegere gratiam.

stabile est: Bacch. 520, stabilest me patri aurum reddere.

stultitia est: Cas. 282, stultitia est te esse tristem; 563; Pers. 798.

suavius est: Pers. 540, te de aliis quam alios de te suaviust fieri doctos.

subolet: H. T. 899, ne subolat esse amicam hanc Cliniae.

susurratur: And. 779, iam susurrari audio civem Atticam esse hanc.

turpe est: Phor. 913, nunc viduam extrudi turpest.

utile est: H. T. 199, nam in metu esse hunc illist utile; Ad. 341.

veri simile est: Aul. 111, veri simile non est hominem pauperem pauxillum parvi facere.

videtur: Curc. 262, neque eum ad me adire neque me magni pendere visum est; Acc. Praet. 19, visum est pastorem ad me adpellere pecus lanigerum; CIL, i, 542, hoc dare sese visum animo suo.

volup est: Rud. 892, volup est me his mulierculis auxilium tetulisse.

Infinitive as Subject with Subject Accusative Understood.

With many verbs and expressions already enumerated as taking the infinitive with subject accusative, we find at times also the infinitive with subject accusative understood. The following are examples of this usage:

addecet: Bacch. 128, (te) mutum esse addecet; Pseud. 568.

aequom est: Stich. 131, non aequomst (nos) abduci; 548; Phor. 450, quod te absente hic filius egit, restitui in integrum aequomst.

certum est: Men. 977, bonum (me) esse certumst.

condecet: Aul. 590, qui ero ex sententia servire servos postulat, in erum matura condecet capessere.

convenit: Acc. 193, cuius sit vita indecoris, mortem fugere turpem haut convenit.

decet: Amph. 836, quae non deliquit, decet audacem esse; Men. 88; Pseud. 1127.

fortasse: Poen. 1004, fortasse medicos nos esse arbitrarier.

iniquom est: Hec. 740, inscitum (me) offerre iniuriam tibi iniquom est.

melius est: Rud. 141 (te) iubere meliust prandium ornari domi.

mirandum est: Capt. 158, non mirandum est (eos) fugitare hanc provinciam.

mirum est: M. G. 354, totiens (te) monere mirumst; 922.

necesse est: Cist. 46, necessest quo tu me modo voles esse, ita esse; Asin. 217.

oportet (frequently): Amph. 322, atque hau longe abesse oportet; 944, primum (te) cavisse oportuit; Aul. 754, non (eam) attactam oportuit; 757; Bacch. 400; 819; Cas. 571; Cist. 584, at non missam oportuit; Epid. 270; Men. 995; M. G. 47; Pers. 273; Rud. 1385; Stich. 112; 130; 726; Trin. 1092, visne aquam petam? :: res quom animam agebat, tum esse offusam oportuit; And. 239, nonne prius communicatum oportuit; H. T. 635, interemptam (eam) oportuit; Ad. 659.

optumum est: Truc. 626, iam te conficiam; (te) occidi optumum est.

opus est: Most. 287, quid opust, quod suom esse nolit, (id) ei ultro ostentarier?

suavius est: Bacch. 1045, si plus perdundum sit, (id) periisse suaviust quam, etc.

superbum est: Hec. 155, reddi (eam) patri, quoi nil dicas viti, superbumst.

volup est: Phor. 610, (te) venire salvom volup est.

vostrum est: Poen. 572, hau vostrumst (vos) iracundos esse.

INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS AN APPOSITIVE.

The infinitive with subject accusative (occasionally understood) is also used with considerable freedom as an appositive, especially after *hoc, haec, id, istuc, istaec;* occasionally with certain other pronouns, and a few nouns. But it is to be noted that this usage is confined to sentences containing some verb or expression which regularly takes the construction of the infinitive with subject accusative, so that while the infinitive in the following examples is not directly

dependent upon a governing verb, yet, as a rule, its appositional use is undoubtedly partly due to the presence of such verb.

hoc: Asin. 407, quid hoc sit, neminem meum dictum magni facere? Aul. 128, hoc cogitato tibi proxumam me esse; 226, venit hoc mi in mentem, ted esse divitem; Bacch. 1099, hoc est demum quod percrucior, me ludificari; Capt. 61 (iniquom est); 701 (aegre est); Cist. 774 (fabulor); Merc. 243; M. G. 1349 (vitio vortat); Pseud. 642, hoc scio, febrim tibi esse; Rud. 22 (in animum inducunt); 187, hoc deo complacitumst, med in incertas regiones eiectam; Stich. 11 (crucior); Trin. 793 (dico); 1132 (miror); And. 409, crede hoc mihi, numquam tecum commutaturum patrem unum verbum; Eun. 199 (scio); 660 (suspicor); 766 (dico); 857; 1069 (credo); Hec. 155 (cognosco); Ad. 272 (dolet); Ad. 803; Lucil. 435 (video); the phrase *hoc unum* occurs with *scio* in Most. 72; And. 281; 506; Eun. 877. In a few of the above examples, the subject acc. of the appositive is understood. Sometimes *hoc* is attracted to the gender of a predicate noun, e.g. Epid. 431, haec stultitiast me illi vitio vortere quod factitavi; Stich. 729.

haec (plu.): Merc. 797, Demiphoni haec eloquar, me istanc protracturum esse in viam; Ad. 964.

id: Amph. 561, praedicare id, domi te esse; Bacch. 98 (flagitium est); Capt. 195 (volo); 564 (planum est); Cas. 429 (aegre est); M. G. 475 (palam est); Rud. 397, id maestast sibi evenisse inopiam; 1201 (miror); Stich. 446; And. 180, id voluit, nos duci falso gaudio; 671 (puto); 811 (facile est); 835 (utilest); H. T. 324; 471 (subsentio); 922 (flagitium est); Eun. 724 (dico); 998 (gaudeo); Phor. 906 (nuntio); Hec. 476 (testor); Ad. 682 (dolet); M. G. 683.

istuc: Capt. 638, satin istuc exquisitum est, fuisse hunc servom in Alide? Merc. 985 (ius est); M. G. 1321 (crucior); Pseud. 313; Stich. 718, haud tuom istuc est te vereri; H. T. 1028.

istaec: Pseud. 430, istaec quae tibi renuntiantur, filium te velle argento circumducere; Merc. 764, palam istaec fiunt te me odisse; attraction, M. G. 878, stultitia istaec sit, me ire in opus alienum.

illud: H. T. 422, illud falsumst, diem adimere aegritudinem hominibus. With attraction: M. G. 703, illa laus est, liberos hominem educare.

quod: Acc. 206, quod esse arbitror periclum, misceri genus.

aliquid: M. G. 1067, quin respondes aliquid, aut facturum aut non facturum (with subject acc. *te* understood)?

With nouns:

audacia: Pseud. 1298, quae istaec audacia, te sic cum corolla ebrium ingrediri?

causa: Hec. 677, hanc ubi dixti causam, te propter tuam matrem non posse habere uxorem.

facinus: Acc. Praet. 26, contueri mirificum facinus, orbem flammeum solis linquier cursu.

factum: Capt. 684, erit mi hoc factum memorabile me meum erum fecisse liberum.

fama: Trin. 689, ne mi hanc famam differant, me meam sororem dedisse.

fallacia: And. 220 ff., fingunt quandam fallaciam, civem Atticam esse hanc.

opus: Cato, Agr. 2, 3, quae opera fieri potuerint, dolia lavari, frumentum transferri, stercus efferri, etc.

res: Bacch. 770, illaec res est magnae dividiae mihi, supterfugisse Chrysalum; Cist. 102.

responsum: Phor. 16, responsum hoc habeat, in medio omnibus palmam esse positam.

unum: Merc. 266, unum scio, me periisse.

verbum: Merc. 771, verum illud verbum esse experior: aliquid mali esse propter vicinum malum.

INFINITIVE WITH SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS PREDICATE.

The only instance I have noted is: Merc. 620, istucine est operam dare bonum sodalem!

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE.
AS OBJECT.

This use occurs with the following verbs and expressions:

A. Denoting Another Action of the Same Subject.

abnuo: Enn. Ann. 193, certare abnueo.

abstineo: Curc. 180, dum mihi abstineant invidere.

adfecto: Bacch. 377, quibus patrem et me adfectas ad probrum appellere.

adgredior: Enn. Ann. 438, adgretus fari; cf. Paulus, p. 5, Th., pro eo quod est adgressus ponitur.

adorno : Epid. 690, tragulam in te inicere adornat.

adpeto: Turp. 159, oculi adpetunt cupide intui.

adsimulo: Cist. 96, adsimulare amare oportet; Trag. Incert. 57.

adsuetus: Asin. 887, ire adsuetum.

agito: Rud. 936, magnas res agito in mentem instruere.

apparo: Asin. 434, delenire apparas.

attendo (=*persevero*): Acc. 279, ne attenderis petere a me !

audeo (very frequent): Aul. 663, non audebit abstrudere; And. 505; H. T. 156; Eun. 619; Phor. 758.

calleo: Pacuv. 75, callent dominum imperia metuere.

caveo: Cato, Agr. 20, 1, eo plumbum effundere caveat.

cerno: Lucil. 160, praesidium castris educere crevit; 332.

certo: Enn. Ann. 304, 3, fluctus extollere certant.

cesso (frequent): Trin. 1135, quid ego cesso hos conloqui ?   Curc. 672; Epid. 342; Pers. 197; And. 846; Eun. 265; Phor. 252.

coepi (very frequent): Epid. 248, coepi ad illas accedere; Men. 483; H. T. 97; Eun. 116; *coeptus sum:* Men. 718, itaque coepta appellari est Canes.

cogito: Amph. 319, me quasi murenam exossare cogitat; Merc. 316; Poen. 1419; Pseud. 475; H. T. 607, quid nunc facere cogitas ? Eun. 777; 897; Afran. 46; Cato, Agr. 1, 1; 3, 1 (bis).

commemini: Curc. 710, non commemini dicere ; M. G. 645.

comparo: Titin. 57, ut cum ea comparemus conloqui.

comperco: Poen. 350, comperce me attrectare.

compesco: Bacch. 463, compesce in illum dicere iniuste !

concesso: Poen. 219, numquam concessamus lavari.

condisco: Curc. 161, merum condidicit bibere; 534; Poen. 514; Pseud. 945.

conor: Trin. 1150, quod conatus sum agere; Asin. 213; Capt. 62; Enn. Trag. 5; Pacuv. 65; 227; Afran. 47; Lucil. 796; 862; Val. Aed. 1.

constituo: Phor. 676, mihi dotem iam constituerunt dare.

consuesco: Pers. 170, mandata non consuevi simul bibere; *consuetus:* Aul. 637, id quidem te datare consuetum; Pacuv. 261.

cuncto: Acc. 72, cunctant subferre laborem.

cupio (very frequent) : Curc. 590, cupio dare mercedem ; Aul. 771 ; Truc. 185 ; H. T. 449 ; Eun. 145 ; 561 ; Enn. Ann. 170.

cupido : Enn. Trag. 216, cupido cepit me proloqui caelo Medeai miserias.

curo : Lucil. 423, Persium non curo legere ; Cato, Agr. 141, 1, uti cures lustrare.

cura : Enn. Ann. 90, ingens cura mis cum concordibus aequiperare.

debeo : Amph. 39, debetis velle quae velimus ; Pers. 160.

decerno : And. 219, quidquid peperisset, decreverunt tollere ; Lucil. 37.

defetiscor : Phor. 589, neque defetiscar usque adeo experirier.

depropero : Poen. 321, deproperant sacruficare.

desino : Men. 122, virum observare desines ; Aul. 523 ; Bacch. 100 ; 439 ; Men. 405 ; Pseud. 307 ; And. 22 ; H. T. 879 ; Eun. 16 ; Hec. 810.

desisto : Bacch. 1171, ut desistas ire oppugnatum ; Cist. 582 ; Men. 245 ; Rud. 682 ; Trin. 1012 ; And. 660 ; Hec. 105 ; Acc. 172.

digno : Pacuv. 166, quom neque me aspicere aequales dignarent ; 212 ; Acc. 447.

disco (16) : Amph. 687, didici dicere ; Cas. 362 ; Merc. 147 ; 508 ; Trin. 631 ; Ad. 125, pater esse disce ab illis qui sciunt ; Afran. 255 ; 283.

do operam : Hec. 553, quam dare operam id scire.

dubito : Epid. 260, quid istuc dubitas dicere ? Bacch. 1117 ; M. G. 1008 ; Poen. 789 ; Pseud. 625 ; 1313 ; Acc. 294 ; 360 ; Com. Incert. 36.

duro : Truc. 326, non quis parumper durare opperirier ?

enitor : And. 596, gnatum mi corrigere enitere !

exanclo : Acc. 269, ferre exanclavimus tyranni saevom ingenium.

exopto : And. 20, quorum aemulari exoptat neclegentiam.

exordior : Hec. 362, unde exordiar narrare.

experior : Capt. 425, magis non factum possum velle quam opera experiar persequi ; Phor. 538 ; Lucil. 705.

expeto : Aul. 652, audire expetis ; Asin. 27 ; Cas. 184 ; 669 ; Cist. 554 ; Curc. 107 ; M. G. 1258 ; Poen. 1131 ; Pseud. 1087 ; Rud. 240 ; 917 ; Trin. 674 ; H. T. 890.

exsequor : Asin. 160, te tractare exsequor ; Merc. 913.

fatiscor : Pacuv. 154, numquam fatiscar facere quod quibo boni.

faveo (= *volo*) : Enn. Ann. 256, moeros complent spectare faventes.

formido: Pseud. 316, si isti formidas credere.

fugito: Hec. 776, quod aliae meretrices facere fugitant.

gaudeo: Acc. 32, omnes gaudent facere recte; Ad. 254.

gestio: Cas. 471, iam osculari gestio; Men. 486; M. G. 8; 1398; Pseud. 116; 1073; Lucil. 699.

incipio: Asin. 448, incipit tinnire; Rud. 462; Truc. 465; 467; And. 493; 821; H. T. 495; Enn. Trag. 231; Acc. 368.

incepto: Curc. 24, numquid facis aut inceptas facinus facere? Trin. 1030.

incipisso: Capt. 802, quid hic homo incipissit facere? Trin. 884.

induco animum: Bacch. 1191, facere inducam animum; And. 834; Eun. 490; Hec. 99.

induco in animum: Hec. 603, non tute incommodam rem in animum induces pati?

infit: Asin. 343, infit percontarier; Bacch. 265; Aul. 318; Merc. 249; Rud. 51; 53.

immemor est (= *obliviscitur*): Pseud. 1104, qui officium facere immemor est.

insisto: Capt. 584, vide ne quid huic insistas credere! Phor. 192; Hec. 381, hanc habere orationem institit; Acc. 134; 428; Trag. Incert. 57; Afran. 81.

insto: Pacuv. 249, Spartam reportare instat.

instituo: Bacch. 1082, ego dare me meo gnato institui; Eun. 19; Ad. 38.

insuesco: Capt. 306, qui imperare insueram; Ad. 55.

intendo: M. G. 380, pergin intendere hanc arguere?

laboro: Lucil. 270, labora discere!

lubido: Bacch. 416, est lubido homini suo animo opsequi; Epid. 97, qui lubidost male loqui? 240; Men. 83; Pers. 121; 188; Poen. 1322; Pseud. 552; Trin. 626; 865.

malo (16): Poen. 706, accipere tu non mavis quam ego dare; Pseud. 140; Stich. 700; Trin. 306; And. 332; H. T. 858; Phor. 658; Hec. 110; Enn. Trag. 222; Acc. 85.

meditor: Ad. 896, meditor esse affabilis, et bene procedit.

memini: Stich 60, meministis petere cibum; qui minus meministis quod opus sit facere? Eun. 340, advocatus mi esse meminerit;

Bacch. 328. — *Memento:* Capt. 231, at scire memento; Epid. 658; Pseud. 1164.

metuo: Aul. 248, metuit congrediri; Most. 1125; Pseud. 304; Trin. 754; Truc. 353, quo intro ire metuas.

metus: Phor. 482, quantum metuist mihi videre patruom (= *metuo videre*).

minitor: Hec. 427, quod nunc minitare facere.

mitto: Aul. 651, scrutari mitto; And. 873, mitte male loqui! so also Pers. 207; And. 904, mitte orare! H. T. 900, mitto iam osculari.

neglego: Merc. 86, mea promissa non neglexit persequi; Most. 141, optigere eam neglegens fui; Amph. 586.

nego: Instances of the infinitive without subject accusative following *nego* are taken as illustrating the infinitive with subject accusative understood; see above p. 386.

nequeo (frequent): Poen. 848, nequivit propitiare Venerem; 1294; Bacch. 91; Capt. 592; Merc. 125; 253; H. T. 320; Eun. 181; 661; *nequitur, nequitum est:* Rud. 1064, ut nequitur comprimi! Frag. 109, retrahi nequitur; Pacuv. 390, quom contendi nequitum vi.

nescio ('know how'): Bacch. 581, fores pultare nescis; M. G. 880; Most. 606; Pers. 762; Ad. 77, fateatur nescire imperare liberis! 220; Enn. Trag. 183; Trag. Incert. 112; Stat. 143.

nil moror: Capt. 16, alieno (sc. *aere*) uti nil moror.

nolo (very frequent): Asin. 835, nolo metui; amari mavolo; Bacch. 1083; And. 155; Enn. Trag. 303; Naev. Com. 36; Afran. 310; Lucil. 145.

novi: Enn. Trag. 133, ut pro viribus tacere ac fabulari noveris; Cato (Jord.), 36, 9, ceteros sequi si norit.

obliviscor: Most. 487, lucernam oblitus fueram exstinguere; Pers. 722; Poen. 118; Pseud. 171; Trin. 1137; And. 841, sum oblitus dicere; Naev. ap. Gell. i, 24, 2.

occepto: Men. 916, iam occeptat insanire; 934.

occipio (frequent): Amph. 107, amare occepit; Asin. 316; 590; Epid. 77; Stich. 579; And. 504, si quid tibi narrare occepi; Hec. 116; *occeptus sum:* Eun. 22, occeptast agi.

occulto: Pers. 493, est res quaedam quam occultabam tibi dicere.

occupo: Most. 566, sed occupabo adire; Poen. 320; Pseud. 921;

Rud. 248; Stich. 89; Enn. Trag. 140; Acc. 380, quem impetum occupemus facere in regem; 650; Titin. 145; Cato (Jord.), 24, 2.

odi: Amph. 900, inimicos semper osa sum optuerier; Capt. 66.

omitto: Merc. 624, flere omitte! Pers. 431; 642; Eun. 989, omitte de te dicere; Phor. 861.

optineo: M. G. 186, earumque artem et disciplinam optineat colere.

opto: Asin. 608, me morti dedere optas; Aul. 11; Hec. 651, hunc videre saepe optabamus diem.

ordior: Trin. 1136, namque hoc commodum orditur loqui.

parco: Bacch. 910, cave parsis in eum dicere! Epid. 464; Pers. 312; Hec. 282, hancine ego vitam parsi perdere! Cato, Agr. 1, 1.

parito: Merc. 649, illo quo nunc ire paritas.

paro: Enn. Ann. 320, sonitum dare voce parabant.

percupio: Asin. 76, percupio obsequi gnato meo.

pergo (frequent): Amph. 262, nunc pergam eri imperium exsequi et me domum capessere; Bacch. 570; Merc. 303; Trin. 162; Truc. 265; And. 522; H. T. 237; Phor. 194.

perpetro: Truc. 465, nisi id ecficere perpetrat.

persequor: Rud. 667, ingredi persequamur.

persevero: Stich. Arg. 1, quod perseverent peregrinantes pauperes sustinere fratres.

pervolo: Epid. 536, pervelim mercedem dare.

pigro: Acc. 294, cur proferre haec pigrem? Enn. Ann. 274, pigret scribendi ferre laborem. Cf. Acc. 32.

ploro: Aul. 308, aquam plorat profundere.

possum (very common): Amph. 147, videre poterit; Bacch. 27; M. G. 782; Pacuv. 100, potestur investigari; Enn. frag. 574, retrahi potestur. — *Potens:* Enn. Ann. 231, bellum tolerare potentes. Details as to the occurrence of *potis sum, potis, pote,* belong to the history of forms.

postulo (21): Amph. 789, nos delirantis facere postulat; Aul. 589; Cas. 963; Men. 794; 1080; M. G. 437; Most. 613; Pseud. 851; Rud. 709; And. 657, nec postulabat nunc quisquam uxorem dare; Eun. 61; Ad. 238; Enn. Sat. 479, qui postulat alterum frustrari; Cato, fr. Jord. 39, 12.

praefestino: Rud. 119, qui praefestinet praeloqui; Afr. 395.

praeopto: Capt. 687, meum me caput praeoptavisse ponere.

praetereo: Merc. 403, quod praeterii dicere.

propero (frequent): Aul. 181, properare propero; Bacch. 1049; Pers. 667; Phor. 436; 845.

queo (frequent): Bacch. 982, ad lacrumas coegi male dictis, quae quivi comminisci; Capt. 100; Merc. 588; Trin. 801; Truc. 326; And. 270; 277; H. T. 453; Phor. 498; Acc. 661, neque impelli quitus sum; Acc. Baehrens, p. 269, 18, unde omnia perdisci ac percipi queuntur; Hec. 572, nosci non quitast; Stat. 279, non sarciri quitur.

quiesco: Most. 1173, tu quiesce hanc rem modo petere.

remitto: And. 827, si cogites, remittas me onerare iniuriis.

scio ('know how'): Capt. 850, scis bene esse, si sit unde; Curc. 620; Epid. 505; Pers. 6; 645; 762; Pseud. 226; 745; Trin. 766; 769; H. T. 196, qui uti scit; Phor. 79; Cato, Agr. 5, 4; 143, 3.

simulo: Aul. 463, simulavit mittere; Cist. 96; Rud. 1399.

soleo (frequent): Bacch. 897, quod dici solet; Capt. 70; Cas. 466; H. T. 363; 371; 520; 548.

studeo (17): Amph. 182, referre studeant gratiam; Bacch. 1161; Poen. 818; And. 822; Hec. 265; Lucil. 103.

studium: Hec. 202, viris esse advorsas studiumst (= *advorsae esse student*).

sueo: Enn. Ann. 61, vi depugnare sues stolidi solida suent.

tempero: Poen. 22, dormire temperent; 33; 1036; Trag. Incert. 15 (?).

tempto: Pacuv. 95, saxum temptans scandere.

teneo (= *abstineo*): Merc. 52, omnes tenerent (*timerent*, Ritschl) credere; (= *scio*): Bacch. 655, qui et bene facere et male tenet.

timeo: see under *teneo.*

vereor: Epid. 41, simul ire mecum veritust; M. G. 1168; Trin. 1149; And. 323, vereor dicere; 488; 936; Phor. 61; Ad. 269; Pacuv. 67, ut verear eloqui; Acc. 157, vereor plus quam fas est captivam hiscere.

volo (extremely common): Amph. 294, volt pallium detexere; 360; Asin. 67, volo amari; Poen. 661; Ad. 151; Enn. Ann. 55, 9; Lucil. 209. For the perfect infinitive used with the force of the present, see below under Tenses of the Infinitive (p. 427).

B.

To this second subdivision belong those cases in which the infinitive fulfils the function of an abstract noun: Curc. 28, ita tuom conferto amare (= *amorem*) semper; Men. 451, qui primus commentus est contionem habere; Bacch. 158, hic vereri (= *verecundiam*) perdidit; Pers. 224, nihili facio scire (= *scientiam*); Poen. 313, ego amo hanc. :: at ego esse et bibere ('eating and drinking') is also usually cited as an illustration of this use.

C. *Aequom censeo* Type.

In several passages we have an infinitive without subject accusative used as object, followed by *aequom*, or some similar word in predicate relation, e.g.

Merc. 117, hau quisquam dignum habet decedere; 132, num quisquam adire dignum arbitratur; Ad. 51, non necesse habeo omnia pro meo iure agere; Acc. 205, qui non sat habuit coniugem inlexe in stuprum; Cato, Agr. 1, 1, ne satis habeas semel circumire; fr. Jord. 24, 5, ecquis est qui aequom censeat poenas dare.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, USED AS SUBJECT.

The infinitive without subject accusative is employed with a large number of impersonal expressions. But there are few established types of usage. Apart from *addecet, aequom est, certum est, decet, decretum est, licet, lubet, melius est, necesse est, oportet, piget, pudet, satius est,* there are few expressions which are used with freedom in this construction. In fact, the large majority of expressions with which the construction appears occur but a single time.

addecet: Amph. 1004, eius studio servire addecet; Cas. 199; Most. 902; Pers. 835; Poen. 328; 1389; Pseud. 738; Rud. 112; 115; 1391; Stich. 518; Trin. 78; Plaut. Frag. 94; Enn. Trag. 257.

aequom est: Amph. 29, mirari non est aequom; Bacch. 924; 1017; Cas. 895; Merc. 81; M. G. 1071; Pseud. 269; Hec. 527; 620; 840.

amarum est: Cist. 68, an amare occipere amarum est?

amici est: Lucil. 428, amici est bene praecipere.

attinet: Pers. 701, quid attinet non scire?

bonum est: Curc. 176, bonum est pauxillum amare; Trin. 462; Cato, fr. Jord. 77, 2.

capital est: Lucil. 438, scimus capital esse irascier.

certa res est: Amph. 705, certa res hanc est obiurigare; Merc. 857; M. G. 267; 398; Most. 706; Trin. 270.

certum est (frequent): Asin. 247, adire certumst mihi; Amph. 265, certumst hominem eludere; Capt. 492; M. G. 303; Truc. 549; And. 311; H. T. 466; Eun. 269; Ad. 718; Lucil. 590.

commodum est: Phor. 1026, quibus est commodum ire.

commodius est: Phor. 603, commodius esse opinor duplici spe utier.

condecet: Turp. 127, etiam amplius apparare condecet; Poen. 305.

condicio: Stich. 118, utra siet condicio pensior virginemne an viduam habere.

conlubet: Amph. 858, qui illi conlubitum siet sic me insimulare; Merc. 258; Most. 295.

consilium est: M. G. 344, consilium est ita facere.

convenit: Merc. 551, rei tuae quaerendae convenit operam dare; Cato, Agr. 7, 1; Matius, 10 (Baehr), edulcare convenit vitam curasque acerbas gubernare; Acc. 193.

decet (frequent): Amph. 267, decet mores huius similis habere; Capt. 196; M. G. 40; 616; Most. 53; Poen. 1402; Truc. 182; Vid. 89; Eun. 789, omnia prius experiri decet; Ad. 506; Enn. Ann. 58; 157.

decretum est: Aul. 572, bibere decretumst; 574; Bacch. 516; Cist. 648; Merc. 1; M. G. 77; Most. 667; Stich. 218; Vid. 61; Cas. 94; H. T. 392; 465; Enn. Ann. 325.

delectat: Cato, fr. Jord. 3, 12, quos delectat populi Romani res gestas describere.

deliberatum est: Afran. 274, deliberatum est non tacere amplius (*me amplius*, Hermann).

difficile est: And. 211, quoi verba dare difficilest.

dignum est: Pseud. 1013, salutem scriptam dignumst dignis mittere.

disciplina est: H. T. 300, disciplina eis demunerarier ancillas.

dispudet: Bacch. 481, alia memorare quae vidi dispudet.

distaedet: Phor. 1011, cum hoc ipso distaedet loqui.

est: Curc. 177, totum insanum amare, hoc est, — quod meus erus

facit; Ad. 131, ambos curare propemodum reposcere illum est quem dedisti; Cato, Agr. Prooem. 1, est interdum praestare mercaturis rem quaerere; 61, 1, quid est bene arare? Lucil. 176, salvere iubere salutem est mittere amico; Asellio, Peter, p. 109, scribere bellum initum, iterare, non praedicare quid senatus decrerit, id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere.

expedit: Capt. 54, expediet fabulae huic operam dare; H. T. 337, nil video quam ob rem accipere hunc mi expediat metum; 388; Hec. 57; Lucil. 482; Cato, Agr. 9.

facile est: Curc. 240, facile est miserum inridere; M. G. 917; Most. 411; 791; Poen. 871; 974; Ad. 862, id esse verum quoivis facilest noscere; Turp. 9.

facinus est: Trin. 23, amicum castigare inmoene est facinus.

fas est: Enn. Frag. 511, si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere quoiquam est.

fit: Trin. 1035, petere honorem pro flagitio more fit; so 1036.

flagitium est: Ad. 422, nam id nobis tam flagitiumst quam illa non facere quae modo dixti.

futtilum est: Enn. Trag. 266, saeviter suspicionem ferre falsam futtilum est.

hominis est: Ad. 734, simulare certe est hominis.

honestius est: Poen. 1232, nisi honestiust prehendi.

humanum est: Merc. 319, humanum amare est; humanum autem ignoscere est.

incidit: Phor. 157, utinam ne Phormioni id suadere in mentem incidisset.

incommodum est: Hec. 153, hoc proferre incommodum mi esse arbitror; 417.

iniurium est: Hec. 71, eandem iniuriumst esse omnibus; 72, iniurium autem est ulcisci advorsarios?

inscitia est: Curc. 185, male mereri de inmerente inscitiast; Acc. 215, id quod multi invideant inscitiast postulare.

insipientia est: Amph. 36, iusta ab iniustis petere insipientiast.

intermissum est: Most. 959, est haud intermissum esse, pergraecari, fidicinas ducere.

lepidum est: Cist. 313, lepidumst amare semper; Pers. 266; Eun. 1018, lepidum tibi visumst, nos inridere?

licet (very frequent): Amph. 388, ut liceat te alloqui; 393, nunc licet mihi loqui; Asin. 935; Aul. 565; Curc. 401; Most. 239; Pseud. 252; Trin. 1173; H. T. 21, licere id facere putat; Eun. 262; Cato, Agr. Prooem.; Lucil. 386. Apparently after this analogy, we find *licentia* with the inf. in Trin. 1034, scuta iacere fugereque hostis more habent licentiam.

liquet: Eun. 331, illum liquet mihi deierare his mensibus sex non vidisse.

lubet (frequent): Aul. 211, quod non lubeat proloqui; Bacch. 353; Cas. 262; Curc. 131; M. G. 826, qui lubitum est illi condormiscere? Stich. 698; And. 816, ipsam despoliare non lubet; Hec. 56; Ad. 445; 766; Cato, Agr. 3, 2; fr. Jord. 16, 16.

lucrum est: Ad. 216, pecuniam in loco neglegere maxumum est lucrum; Phor. 61, ubi quid mihi lucri est te fallere?

malum: Trin. 673, insanum malumst in hospitium devorti ad Cupidinem.

melius est (frequent): Men. 802, melius sanam est mentem sumere; M. G. 292; 881; Pers. 346; Ad. 180, ante aedis non fecisse erit melius hic convicium; Acc. 267, melius pigrasse quam deproperasse est nefas; Lucil. 634.

meliusculum est: Curc. 489, meliusculum est monere.

meticulosa res est: Most. 1101, nescis quam meticulosa res sit ire ad iudicem.

matronae est: Most. 190, matronae est unum inservire amantem.

in mentem est, in mentem venit: Amph. 710, qui istuc in mentemst ex me percontarier? Trin. 77.

meum est: H. T. 549, non est mentiri meum; so also Lucil. 427.

mirum est: Phor. 848, num mirum aut novomst revocari?

miseria est: Pers. 238, certare tecum miseriast; Poen. 820; Truc. 745.

molestum est: M. G. 672, tibi tanto sumptui esse mihi molestumst.

mora est: Capt. 396, quae memini, mora est monerier.

mos est: Capt. 985, mos est hominibus oblivisci; Cato, fr. Jord. 83, 1, vestiri in foro honeste mos erat.

navorum est: Enn. Ann. 295, navorum imperium servare est induperantum.

necessarium est: Rud. 252, id necessarium est perpeti.

necesse est, necessus est, necessum est: Amph. 501, mihi necesse est ire; Men. 118; Trin. 144; H. T. 209, necesse est consilia consequi consimilia; Phor. 296; Enn. Trag. 340; Cist. 626; M. G. 1118; Stich. 219; Afran. 396; Scipio Min., Meyer, p. 212; Eun. 998, quia necessus fuit hoc facere.

nihil est: Capt. 344, nihil est ignotum ad illum mittere; Truc. 769; Eun. 641.

nostrum est: H. T. 578, nostrumst intellegere.

odio est: Most. 705, ire dormitum odiost.

odiosum est: Bacch. 1152, quam odiosum est mortem amplexari!

officium est: Cas. 585, non matronarum officiumst viris alienis subblandirier; Truc. 435; And. 330, ne utiquam officium liberi esse hominis puto postulare.

onus est: Truc. 470, mulieri male facere melius onus est quam bene.

operae pretium est: Cas. 879, est operae pretium auribus accipere; Most. 842; Poen. 1174; And. 217, audire eorumst operae pretium audaciam; Enn. Ann. 345.

oportet (20), much less frequent than the use of *oportet* with subject accusative: Bacch. 477, itane oportet rem mandatam gerere amici? 759, iam bis bibisse oportuit; Cist. 96; Men. 167; Most. 801, id domum trahere oportet; Truc. 169, rapere otiose oportuit; 461, nullam rem oportet dolose adgrediri; H. T. 636, interemptam oportuit, non simulare mortem; Phor. 242; 527, itane facere oportet? Afran. 319; Lucil. 761; Cist. 574, quoi illam dedisset exquisisse oportuit; Cato, Agr. 1, 2, bene nitere oportebit.

optumum est: Enn. Trag. 132, (ita) sapere opino esse optumum.

opus est: M. G. 636, quid opus nota noscere? Poen. 311; H. T. 578, utquomque opus sit opsequi.

opus ('task'): Most. 379, miserum est opus igitur demum fodere puteum; M.G. 682.

par est: Poen. 1396, quid mihi par facere sit; Rud. 675.

patris est: Hec. 529, neque arbitrari patris est aliter.

periculum est: Poen. 633, malo bene facere tantundemst periculum quantum bono male facere; Pseud. 1076; Cato, fr. Jord. 33, 2, arbitror rem publicam curare summum periculum esse.

pericli est: Asin. 898, quid pericli sit vitium dicere; And. 867, erum quid sit pericli fallere.

perlubet: Capt. 833, perlubet hunc hominem conloqui; Rud. 353.

persuasum est: Bacch. 1016, persuasumst facere.

piaculum est: Enn. Trag. 286, palam muttire plebeio piaculum est.

piget: Aul. 210, ne id te pigeat proloqui; Most. 415; Rud. 634; Trin. 348; Truc. 528; Pacuv. 44; 144; Cato, Agr. 1, 4, eos pigeat vendidisse.

praestat: Capt. 327, est ubi damnum praestet facere quam lucrum; Trin. 345.

praestabilius est: Hec. 284, quanto fuerat praestabilius ubivis gentium agere aetatem!

principium est: Enn. Trag. 378, flagiti principium est nudare inter civis corpora.

probrum est: Acc. 149, vinci nullum est probrum.

in prolubio est: Naev. Com. 31, et volo et vereor et facere in prolubio est.

pudet: Amph. Frag. xvii, nilne te pudet in conspectum ingredi? Asin. 71; Cas. 897; Men. 708; M. G. 622; Most. 1154; Poen. 1301; Pseud. 282; Trin. 344; 787; H. T. 1041, pudet dicere verbum turpe; Hec. 231; Ad. 562; Pacuv. 144; Acc. 103; Com. Incert. 30; Afran. 272, me pudet aliquid sufferre Graece. Apparently after this analogy, we find:

pudor: Com. Inc. 60, pudor est eloqui.

pulchrum est: Cornelia (Peter), p. 222, dices pulchrum esse inimicos ulcisci.

quantum est: Pers. 595, quantum est adhibere hominem amicum!

quanti est: Eun. 791, quantist sapere!

quid est: H. T. 971, disce quid sit vivere!

recipitur ('the right is reserved'): Cato, Agr. 149, 2, bubus binis domino pascere recipitur.

refert: M. G. 809, sed quid meminisse id refert? Truc. 71; Phor. 646.

religio est: H. T. 228, nil esse mihi religiost dicere.

restat: Phor. 85, restabat aliud nil nisi oculos pascere.

ridiculum est: H. T. 353, ridiculumst istuc me admonere.

saluti est: Capt. 555, quibus insputari saluti fuit; Eun. 940.

sat est: Stich. 692, sat est servo homini modeste facere sumptum.

satius est (12): Bacch. 151, vixisse nimio satiust quam vivere; Cist. 42; 662; H. T. 474, tibi perdere talentum satius est; Phor. 956; Ad. 58; Acc. 472; Lucil. 448.

segnities est: Trin. 796, diem sermone terere segnities merast.

suave est: As. 642, vobis suave est fabulari; Truc. 342; H. T. 482, ut non sit suave vivere.

scitum est: H. T. 210, scitumst periclum ex aliis facere; Phor. 821.

stultitia est: Stich. 139, stultitiast venatum ducere invitas canes.

stultum est: Eun. 761, quod cavere possis stultum admittere est.

taedet: Phor. 487, taedet iam audire eadem miliens.

tuom est: Poen. 573, nec tuom est amicis iniuste loqui; And. 678.

usus est: Asin. 376, dico ut usust fieri; Hec. 327, non usus factost mihi hunc intro sequi.

utibile est: Phor. 690, quid minus utibile fuit quam hoc ulcus tangere?

utile esse: CIL, i, 201, 9, neque id vobis oetile esse facere.

verbum : Rud. 1321, miserum verbum est habuisse et nihil habere.

virtus est: Pers. 268, virtus est, ubi occasio admonet, dispicere.

vis est: Truc. 753, vis est experirier.

volup est: M. G. 277, te volup est convenisse.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, AS APPOSITIVE.

The infinitive without subject accusative occurs as an appositive, especially with pronouns, also with a few nouns, as follows:

hoc: Asin. 509, hocine est pietatem colere, matri imperium minuere! Aul. 235, hoc magnumst periculum, ab asinis ad boves transcendere; 587, hoc est servi facinus frugi, facere quod persequor; 593, hoc esse officium reor, retinere ad salutem, non impellere; Capt. 750, vis haec quidem est et trahi et trudi simul; Curc. 670, hoc volo, meam rem agere; Most. 1091; 1165, si hoc pudet, fecisse sumptum; Rud. 191; And. 675, hoc tibi debeo, conari noctisque et dies; Ad. 74, hoc patriumst, potius consuefacere filium sua sponte recte facere; Stat. 28; Lucil. 914.

illud: Trin. 259, illud est dulce, esse et bibere; 809, lepida illast causa, dicere apud portitores inspectas esse.

id: Capt. 208, hau nos id deceat, fugitivos imitari; Merc. 744, id habet pro cibo, videre, amplecti, osculari; Pseud. 576, ea stultitiast, facinus magnum timido cordi credere; Trin. 697; H. T. 49, eum esse quaestum in animum induxi maxumum, servire vostris commodis; Phor. 768.

istuc: Cist. 78, matronae magis conducibile est istuc, unum amare; Pseud. 448; H. T. 566, istaec contumeliast, hominem amicum recipere ad te; Acc. 460.

facinus: Rud. 393, o facinus impudicum, servire postulare; Phor. 613, facinus indignum, sic circumiri.

aequom: Stich. 559, aequom postulabat, accipere pro tibicina.

opus: Cato, Agr. 2, 5, reliqua opera curare uti perficiantur: rationes putare, argentariam, frumentariam.

quaestus: Cist. 376, eum quaestum facio, nil promittere.

res: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 9, 12, Gallia duas res persequitur, rem militarem et argute loqui.

INFINITIVE WITHOUT SUBJECT ACCUSATIVE, AS PREDICATE.

In this use the subject is regularly either a pronoun or another infinitive:

hoc: Asin. 509, hocinest pietatem colere? Bacch. 1068, hoc est incepta efficere pulchre; Merc. 355, hoccine est amare? Ad. 707, hoc est patrem esse aut hoc est filium esse?

id: Trin. 637, an id est sapere? And. 896, si id peccare est; H. T. 324, si id saperest.

illuc: Eun. 782, illuc est sapere.

istuc: Hec. 608, istuc sapere est; Ad. 386.

Nouns: Cato, Agr. 61, 2, cetera cultura est multum sarire.

An infinitive stands as subject in this construction in the examples cited above, p. 407 f., under *est,* as exemplifying the use of the infinitive as subject.

USE OF THE IMPERSONAL INFINITIVE.

The infinitive used impersonally occurs both as subject and object; also occasionally as an appositive.

As Object.

The impersonal infinitive as object is found after verbs like the following. The list is only partial and illustrative.

accipio : Cato, fr. Jord. 62, 6, accepi ei potius credendum esse.

aio : Curc. 679, argentariis male credi qui aiunt; And. 534, ex te auditum qui aibant.

autumo : H. T. 19, neque se pigere autumat.

arbitror : Aul. 757, oportere arbitror; Bacch. 385; Men. 985; Phor. 814, commodius esse arbitror; Hec. 153.

audio : And. 779, iam susurrari audio.

censeo : Cas. 411, tibi cavendum censeo; Men. 345; Rud. 407; 961a; And. 794, paulum interesse censes? H. T. 214; 462; Phor. 457; Pacuv. 85. In connection with *aequom* as predicate, Stich. 293, ad me adiri et supplicari mihi aequom censeo.

clamo : Ad. 91, clamant indignissume factum esse.

cogito : H. T. 239, non cogitas hinc longule esse?

confido : Amph. 935, confido fore; Capt. 171; Cist. 73; M. G. 941.

credo : M. G. 359, credo tibi esse pereundum; And. 699, ut ne per me stetisse credat; H. T. 560; Eun. 245; Phor. 855; Hec. 141; Ad. 58.

dico : Curc. 680, et bene et male credi dico; And. 205, neque tu dicas tibi non praedictum! H. T. 863.

disputo : And. 15, disputant non decere.

do fidem : Eun. 1060, do fidem futurum.

duco : Men. 981, in rem esse ducunt; Most. 814.

existumo : Most. 814, esse existumo humani ingeni; H. T. 30, ne pro se dictum existumet; Eun. 4; 5.

fateor : Bacch. 562, fateor factum; Hec. 838, factum fateor.

gaudeo : Cist. 15, ventum gaudeo.

glorior : H. T. 765, gloriare evenisse.

insto : Merc. 242, instare factum simia; And. 147, instat factum.

intellego : Capt. 766, intellego redauspicandum esse in catenas; Pers. 376; And. 4, aliter evenire intellegit; Eun. 883; Acc. 119.

invideo : Truc. 745, invidere alii bene esse.

invenio : Aul. 758, invenies oportere.

iubeo: Stich. 598, iuben ad illum renuntiari?

iudico: Epid. 707, factum iudico; M. G. 1435; Ad. 960, iudico esse aequom.

malo: And. 427, omnis sibi malle melius esse quam alteri.

nolo: Cas. 501, argento parci nolo; Pers. 358; 851; Pseud. 388, nolo bis iterari.

opinor: Cas. 340, non opinor posse; Phor. 603, commodius esse opinor; Enn. Trag. 132.

patior: Bacch. 464, stultus es qui male aegre patere dici; Pseud. 1135; Stich. 125; Trin. 352; 586.

promitto: Asin. 97, promitto tibi non obfuturum.

puto: Bacch. 1083, aequom esse puto; Amph. 172.

renuntio: And. 508, renuntio futurum.

reperio: Men. 683, numquam reperies factum.

scio: Pers. 211, multi ita esse sciunt; H. T. 529; Phor. 588; Hec. 425; Lucil. 606.

sentio: Capt. 381, recte convenisse sentio; Hec. 315, trepidari sentio et cursari; Lucil. 386.

sino: Poen. 117, sinite transigi; Cato, Agr. 5, 2, inpune ne sinat esse.

specto: Rud. 1249, spectavi is plaudier.

spero: Men. 1094, spero fore; M. G. 1231; Truc. 189; H. T. 103, licere speras? Phor. 1025; Ad. 71.

teneo: M. G. 780, ita esse teneo.

video: Asin. 24, video necesse esse; Bacch. 559; 1209; Poen. 397; H. T. 1053.

volo: Bacch. 83, ubi lepide voles esse tibi; Capt. 460; Most. 313; Pers. 578, iri hinc volo; Rud. 1035; Stich. 154, voli intervisi; 187; 563; 673; And. 198, velle ostendi; Phor. 306; 855.

As Subject.

The impersonal infinitive occurs less frequently as subject than as object. It is found with the following expressions:

aequom est: Poen. 490, credo, ut mi aequomst credier; Ad. 968.

decet: Curc. 352, neque diem decet demorarier neque nocti nocerier; M. G. 737; Poen. 866.

desitum est: Most. 958, desitum est potarier.

inductum est: Cato, fr. Jord. 37, 22, inductum est male facere impoene, bene facere non impoene licere.

intermissum est: Most. 959, haud intermissum est bibi.

licet: Pers. 376, lubere tibi per me licere intellego; 377; 799.

melius est: Pseud. 1, meliust exsurgier.

miseria est: Truc. 745, invidere alii bene esse miseria est.

oportet: Merc. 724, dictum oportuit; 950, sic fieri oportet; Most. 1093, factum iam esse oportuit; Pers. 448, reditum oportuit; Stich. 354; H. T. 200, mansum oportuit; 562; Ad. 955; Com. Incert. 42, nec mulieri nec gremio credi oportet; Cato, fr. Jord. 62, 10, oportet credi.

optumum est: Asin. 908, invadi optumumst.

piget: Trin. 661, me piget parum te pudere.

potest: Pseud. 268, potest obsisti; Truc. 637, persuaderi potest; And. 691, quam facile potuerat quiesci! 699, si poterit fieri; 922; H. T. 279; Phor. 402, dici non potest; 640, non potuit melius pervenirier; 773; Hec. 90; Ad. 302, unde emergi non potest.

solet: Rud. 271, veniri solet.

With *desitum est, potest,* and *solet,* it is possible, and perhaps better, to regard the infinitive not as subject but rather as employed after the analogy of the regular personal use of the infinitive with these verbs.

<p style="text-align:center">IMPERSONAL INFINITIVE AS APPOSITIVE.</p>

I have noted but a single instance of this: M. G. 915, hoc cogitato, facile esse navem facere.

<p style="text-align:center">INFINITIVE TO BE SUPPLIED FROM CONTEXT.</p>

Expressions regularly taking the infinitive are found with some frequency with the accusative alone (either as subject or as object) where the infinitive can easily be supplied from the context, e.g. Asin. 82, quom me adiit, ut pudentem gnatum aequomst patrem (sc. adire); Bacch. 1159, cor stimulo foditur :: aequius coxendicem (sc. fodi); Capt. 619, audibis vera (sc. esse) quae nunc falsa opinare; Cas. 243, scio plus quam tu me arbitrare; Merc. 50, negitare me natum suom; M. G. 1273, viri armati istuc faciunt, ne mirere mulierem;

Pers. 286, tu te numquam speras (sc. fore) ; 834 ; Poen. 1090 ; 1115,
vin eam videre ? : : filias malo meas ; Rud. 47, ut se aequom est
(facere) ; 570 ; 311, quid agitis ? : : ut piscatorem aequomst ; 1010 ;
1033, ecquem novisti ? : : oportet vicinos meos ; 1074 ; 1075, si ille
te comprimere solitust, hic noster nos non solet ; 1091 ; 1413 ; Stich.
448, licet haec Athenis nobis (facere) ; 530 ; Trin. 306 ; 378 ; Truc.
775, egon tibi male dicam ? : : tibi te mavelim ; H. T. 156, nec
credere ausus quae est aequom patri ; 570 ; 949 ; Eun. 279 ; Phor.
113 ; 399, expedivi quibus me oportuit (sc. expedire) ; 447 ; Hec. 120,
ille primo se negare (ducturum).

INFINITIVE DEPENDENT ON NOUNS.

In connection with the discussion of the infinitive with verbs, there
were noted various nouns which took the infinitive after the analogy
of related verbs, e.g. *rumor* (Hec. 39) ; *fama* (Hec. 775) ; *licentia*
(Trin. 1034) ; *pudor* (Com. Incert. 60) ; so also *fides*, *spes*, and others.
Different from the foregoing, in which the infinitive stands in relation
of subject or object to the verbal idea involved in the noun, are the
following instances, in most of which the infinitive seems to approach
its primitive purpose function :

modus : Men. 233, quid modi futurumst illum quaerere ?

occasio : Curc. 59, ut quaeque illi occasiost surrupere se ad me ;
Capt. 423, nunc adest occasio bene facta cumulare ; Pers. 725, nunc
est illa occasio inimicum ulcisci ; Poen. 659, agere tuam rem occasi-
ost ; 1212, facere occasiost ; Phor. 885, summa eludendi occasiost
mihi nunc senes et Phaedriae curam adimere argentariam.

opera : Men. 244, operam praeterea numquam sumam quaerere ;
Aul. 341, domo aps te auferto, ne operam perdas poscere ; Pseud.
1141, operam fac compendi quaerere.

tempus : Asin. 912, tempus est subducere hinc me ; Most. 714, tem-
pus nunc est senem adloqui ; Acc. 290, datur tempus in castra reverti ;
with subject accusative : M. G. 1218, nunc nos tempus est malas
peiores fieri ; And. 631, ubist tempus promissa iam perfici ; H. T.
168, sed ut diei tempus est, tempust (Bentley's addition) monere me
hunc vicinum ; Hec. 597, tempust me concedere ; joined with *occasio*
Men. 552, dum datur mi occasio tempusque abire.

THE INFINITIVE WITH ADJECTIVES.

I have noted the following instances of the occurrence of the infinitive with adjectives:

animatus : Truc. 966, si quis animatust facere.

defessus : Epid. 197, per omnem urbem quem sum defessus quaerere; 719, sumus defessi quaerere; Merc. 805, defessus sum urbem totam pervenarier.

aegrotus : Trin. 76, ut te videre audireque aegroti sient.

inmortalis : M. G. 888, ea inmortalis memoriast meminisse.

lentus : Lucil. 295, solvere nulli lentus.

occupatus : Merc. 288, non sum occupatus amico operam dare.

paratus : Phor. 427, paratus facere; Enn. Ann. 170, alter pugnare paratust; Acc. 434, paratus sum petere pestem.

With *paratus* the infinitive is clearly to be referred to the primitive purpose use.   With *animatus* and *aegrotus* we may conceive that the construction has been influenced by the ideas of wishing and the opposite involved in these expressions.   With the other adjectives the use is loose and its precise genesis is not clear.   *Neglegens sum* (Most. 141) and *inmemor sum* (Pseud. 1104) have been classified above; with these the infinitive is used as object.

In Andria 337, the MSS. give nisi ea quae nil opus sunt scire. Fabricius changed *scire* to *sciri*, in which he is followed by recent editors.   But there seems no warrant for the change; *scire* is loosely attached to *opus*, like *meminisse* to *inmortalis* in M. G. 888.

INFINITIVE OF PURPOSE.

The primitive character of this use has already been explained above (p. 366).   The following are the chief illustrations of its occurrence in Early Latin.   The arrangement is according to the verbs after which the construction occurs.

apparo : Asin. 601, qui sese parere apparent huius legibus.

comparo : Eun. 48, an ita me comparem, non perpeti contumelias? Turp. 99, numquam unius me comparavi servire elegantiam.

curro : Asin. 910, ecquis currit pollinctorem accersere?

  recurro : Trin. 1015, recurre petere!

do : Pers. 821, bibere da! And. 484, quae iussi ei dari bibere;

Cato, Agr. 89, dato bibere; bibere dato; so 103; Titin. 78, date illi biber; Lucil. 170, da bibere.

eo: Bacch. 107, turbare qui huc it; Bacch. 354, ibit aurum arcessere; Most. 66, ire in Piraeum volo parare piscatum; Phor. 102, eamus visere; Hec. 189, it visere; 345, intro iit videre; Enn. frag. 534, ibant viere corollam.

exeo: Cas. 855, eximus ludos visere.

abeo: Bacch. 900, abivit aedem visere Minervae.

mitto: Cas. 688, hunc missa sum ludere; Pseud. 642, reddere hoc, non perdere erus me misit; Eun. 528, misit porro orare ut venirem; Cael. Antip. (Peter), 101, 6.

perrepto: Rud. 223, latebris perreptavi quaerere conservam.

proficiscor: Rud. 847, ad me profectu's ire.

progredior: Turp. 153, progredior foras visere quid hic tumulti.

venio: Bacch. 631, venerat aurum petere; Poen. 1175, qui eo visere venit; Rud. 94, venio visere; so Piso (Peter), 84, 4; Truc. 167, venis querimoniam referre.

voco: Truc. 547, vocatus sum ire.

HISTORICAL INFINITIVE.[1]

Of the many explanations offered to account for the origin of this construction, none can be regarded as satisfactory. The earliest of these explanations goes back to classical times. Quintilian, viii, 6, 21, refers to older grammarians who explained Virgil, Aen. xi, 142, Arcades ad portas ruere, as the result of ellipsis. In ix, 3, 58, Quintilian is more explicit. Commenting on the words *stupere gaudio Graecus* occurring in a speech of Caelius, he adds : simul enim auditur 'coepit.' So Priscian, xviii, 48, sic ergo et apud nos cum imperfectum sit, 'dicere coepi' pro 'dicebam,' 'scribere coepi' pro 'scribebam'; per ellipsin verbi 'coepi' solent auctores proferre verba infinita, ut Terentius And. 146, 'ego illud sedulo negare factum.' Deest enim 'coepi'; 'negare' pro 'negabam.' Other verbs were sometimes understood besides *coepi*, e.g. Servius on Virg. Aen. x, 458, ire prior

[1] Mohr, De infinitivo historico, Halle, 1878; Jänicke, Jahrb. für Klass. Phil. 151, p. 134 ff.; Wackernagel, Verhandlungen der 39ten Philologenversammlung, p. 276 ff.; Wölfflin, Archiv für lat. Lexikog. x, 177 ff.; Wisén, ibid. xv, p. 282 ff.; Kretschmer, Glotta, ii, p. 270 ff.

Pallas, says: subaudis voluit ire. In more recent times this theory has been revived by Jänicke, op. cit. p. 134 ff. Jänicke rests his support largely on the fact that *coepi* with a dependent infinitive often precedes the historical infinitive. But as Kretschmer justly observes, op. cit. p. 272, between the failure to repeat *coepi* with successive infinitives and its complete omission there is a great difference. J. gives no explanation why *coepi* alone is thus omitted and why we do not find instances of the omission of other verbs. Kretschmer further points out that even if we supply *coepi* with the historical infinitive, there are many cases in which this fails to suit the context, e.g. Merc. 46, obiurigare pater haec noctes et dies; Virg. Aen. iv, 421, solam nam perfidus ille te colere, arcanos etiam tibi credere sensus; Ad. 863, ille suam semper egit vitam in otio, in conviviis, clemens, placidus nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus: sibi vixit; sibi sumptum fecit.

The view of Wackernagel, op. cit. p. 276 ff., makes the historical infinitive originally an imperative infinitive (see above, p. 366). In support he cites the fact that in various Slavic languages the imperative itself is thus used in narration. The usage is supposed to have arisen by conceiving the occurrence as the execution of an order. Cf. Trin. 288, quod manu non queunt tangere, tantum fas habent quo manus abstineant; cetera rape, trahe, fuge, late, where the imperatives are equivalent to *rapiunt, trahunt, fugiunt, latent.* So also Pseud. 137, eo enim ingenio hi sunt flagritribae qui haec habent consilia: ubi data occasiost, rape, clepe, tene, harpaga, bibe, es, fuge. Psychologically therefore there is no difficulty in the development assumed by Wackernagel. The real difficulty in the way of accepting his theory is the absence of evidence to show that Latin originally had the imperative infinitive, and the fact that the imperative itself did not in Latin (as in Slavic) become an instrument of historical narration.

Wisén, op. cit. p. 282 ff., explains the historical infinitive as by origin not an infinitive, but a perfect indicative, 3d plural (*amare* for *amavere*), which was erroneously identified with the infinitive. At the start this, of course, was equivalent only to *illi amaverunt.* Later it came to function as *ille amavit,* and (with subject expressed) as *ego amavi.* The usage also, according to Wisén, extended to

infinitives of other conjugations, *monere, dicere, audire,* including deponents, as *mirari, tuerier,* etc. But a conclusive consideration against this theory is the fact that according to Wisén's hypothesis the historical infinitive should have aoristic value, whereas according to actual usage and the express testimony of Priscian, xviii, 48, it has the equivalence of the imperfect.

Kretschmer (op. cit. p. 277 ff.) suggests that the historical infinitive may have developed from some such loose descriptive use of the infinitive as we see in German and other modern languages, e.g. Goethe, Egmont, Clärchen's song:

> Freudvoll und leidvoll, gedankenvoll sein;
> Langen und bangen in schwebender Pein,
> Himmelhoch jauchzend, zum Tode betrübt,
> Glücklich allein ist die Seele die liebt.

Kretschmer cites similar passages from Middle High German and from various modern languages, but he fails to make clear how the transition could take place from achronistic descriptive infinitives of the kind he cites to narrative infinitives referring to the past.

Examples.

Amph. 229 (consonat terra, clamorem utrimque ecferunt). imperator utrimque Iovi vota suscipere, hortari exercitum. (tum pro se quisque id quod quisque potest, edit, ferro ferit); 1112 (postquam pueros conspicatae, pergunt ad cunas). ego cunas recessim trahere; tantoque angues acrius persequi; Aul. 19 (coepi observare . . .). atque ille vero minus minusque impendio curare minusque me impertire honoribus. (ita a me factum est); Bacch. 289 (nostra navis solvitur). ubi portu eximus, homines remigio sequi. (quoniam sentio, navem statuimus); Merc. 46 (leno ut quidque poterat rapiebat domum). obiurigare pater haec, perfidiam lenonum expromere; interdum conloqui; abnuere, negitare me natum suom. conclamitare tota urbe, et praedicere; 240 (dicit capram uxoris dotem ambedisse). mihi illud videri mirum. instare factum simia atque hoc denique respondet . . . et coepit inridere me; ego enim lugere atque abductam illam aegre pati; Rud. 606 (ago cum illa nequid noceat meis popularibus). atque illa nimio iam fieri ferocior. (videtur mihi mini-

tarier): Trin. 836 (circumstabant navem venti), imbres atque procellae frangere malum, ruere antemnas, scindere vela; And. 62, sic vita erat: facile omnes perferre ac pati; cum quibus erat eis sese dedere; eorum studiis obsequi . . . (sapienter vitam instituit); 96, quom id mihi placebat, tum uno ore omnes omnia bona dicere et laudare fortunas meas. (Chremes ad me venit); 146 (venit ad me clamitans) . . . ego illud sedulo negare factum.   (ille instat); 368, puerum inde abiens conveni: holera et pisciculos minutos ferre; H. T. 895, magis etiam instare; Eun. 401, rex te ergo in oculis gestare. : : vero: credere omnem exercitum . . . (tum me solum abducebat); invidere omnes mihi, mordere; ego non flocci pendere; illi invidere; 432, risu omnes qui aderant emoriri. (denique metuebant omnes me); 515 (iam tum erat suspicio). ipsa adcumbere mecum, mihi sese dare, sermonem quaerere. (huc evasit); 618 (militem rogat); ille continuo irasci, neque negare audere; Thais porro instare ut hominem invitet. (invitat). miles vero sibi putare adductum aemulum . . . miles tendere; Phor. 92 (intervenit adulescens quidam lacrumans). nos mirarier. (rogamus quid sit); 117 (negat). noster quid ageret nescire. (illam ducere cupiebat); Hec. 120, ille primo negare; 165, iniurias viri omnes ferre; 182, fugere e conspectu, videre nolle; 826, ille alias res agere se simulare; Ad. 44 (uxorem numquam habui).   ille contra haec omnia: ruri agere vitam; semper parce se habere. (uxorem duxit); 864 (egit vitam in otio), nulli laedere os, adridere omnibus; (sibi vixit); Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 17, 3, compluriens eorum milites alteri alteros occidere, multi ad hostes transfugere, in imperatorem impetum facere; 58, 10, descendit de cantherio, inde staticulos dare, ridicularia fundere; Acc. 438, conlocat sese in locum celsum; hinc manibus rapere raudus saxeum grande et grave; Afran. 127, ego misera risu clandestino rumpier, torpere mater, amens ira fervere; Calpurn. Piso, Peter, p. 82, 9, L. Tarquinium, collegam suom, metuere eumque orat ut Roma concedat.

Most of the citations by Mohr from Lucilius and the fragments of the dramatists are too uncertain to warrant recognition as illustrations of this usage.

In one instance we have an interrogative historical infinitive: Eun. 391, magnas vero agere gratias Thais mihi?

An examination of the foregoing material substantiates fully the

conclusions of Wölfflin (op. cit. p. 180 ff.) that in Early Latin, reflexive uses are rare, that deponents occur with freedom, while the passive[1] does not yet appear. Wölfflin notes also that the historical infinitive rarely occurs accompanied by a subordinate clause (as in Bacch. 289). More commonly, too, we have a group of two or more infinitives. Instances where we have but one (e.g. Merc. 242; And. 146; H. T. 895; Acc. 438; Calp. Piso, 82, 9) are infrequent.

As already stated above (p. 421), the historical infinitive has the equivalence of the imperfect, not of the historical perfect. Hence momentary acts cannot be expressed by it. This explains the frequent shift from the historical infinitive to the historical perfect in the same sentence; see the above examples.

INFINITIVE IN EXCLAMATIONS.[2]

"From phrases like Bacch. 237, nam meus formidat animus nostrum tam diu ibi desidere neque redire filium; Capt. 600, crucior lapidem non habere me; Asin. 407, quid hoc sit negoti, neminem meum dictum magni facere? 127, sicine hoc fit, foras aedibus me eici? it is but a step to the Infinitive of Exclamation, e.g. Pers. 42, sicine hoc te mihi facere?" (Lindsay, Syntax of Plautus, p. 75). To Lindsay's examples of origin may be added: Poen. 842, haec quom video fieri, crucior; pretiis emptos maxumis apud nos expeculiatos servos fieri suis eris, where one may well hesitate as to whether *servos fieri* depends upon *crucior* or is an infinitive of exclamation; Rud. 393, o facinus impudicum! quam liberam esse oporteat servire postulare! Hec. 547, adeon me esse pervicacem censes? (the origin perhaps of expressions like adeon pervicaci esse animo, in Hec. 532); Hec. 613, quid vis? :: hinc abire matrem (sc. iubes)? minime!

Infinitives of the type under consideration fall into two classes: 1) Without *-ne;* 2) With *-ne.* Whether the *-ne* in infinitives of the second class is interrogative, as is suggested above, or is intensive, as urged by Warren (American Journal of Philology, ii, p. 50 ff.), is uncertain.

[1] Afran. 127, rumpier, is middle.

[2] Kraz, Die sogenannte unwillige Frage mit dem Accusativ und Infinitiv, 1862; Gustav Müller, Ueber die sogenannten unwilligen Fragen, 1875.

A. Infinitives of Exclamation without -*NE*.

1) Present Tense: Bacch. 66, penetrare huius modi in palae-
stram! 483, manum sub vestimenta ad corpus tetulit, neque pudere
quicquam! Cas. 89, non mihi licere meam loqui atque cogitare!
Curc. 623, servom antestari! Men. 1005, erum meum luci deripier
in via! Stich. 765, stantem stanti dare amicum amicae! And. 870,
tantum laborem capere! 879, adeo inpotenti esse animo! H. T. 401,
me non licere frui! 630, tantam esse inscitiam! Eun. 209, ah rogi-
tare, quasi difficile sit! Phor. 233, non simultatem meam revereri!
non pudere! 977, non hoc publicitus scelus hinc asportarier! 1042,
nil pudere! Naev. Com. 72, quae ego probavi, ea non audere quem-
quam regem rumpere! Eun. Trag. 47.

2) Perfect Tense: Asin. 580, edepol senem Demaenetum lepidum
fuisse! Bacch. 1102, hoc servom meum facere esse ausum! Capt.
945, vae misero mihi: propter meum caput labores homini evenisse!
783, ad illum modum sublitum os esse mi! Epid. 521, ei! sic data
esse verba! Merc. 785, sic me nuptam tam male! measque in aedis
sic scorta obductarier! H. T. 503, ita comparatam esse naturam
omnium! Phor. 503, tum hoc esse mi obiectum malum! 884, tantam
fortunam esse his datam! Hec. 227, non te pro his curasse rebus!
Ad. 562, non puduisse verberare senem! 629, non me hanc rem patri
indicasse! Cato, fr. Jord. 41, 9, iniurias te facere ausum esse!

B. Infinitives of Exclamation with -*NE*.

1) Present Tense: Bacch. 152, magistron quemquam discipulum
minitarier! Curc. 200, hoccine fieri ut inmodestis te moderes mori-
bus! 695, hocine pacto me abripi! M. G. 626, hancine aetatem exer-
cere mei amoris gratia! Pers. 42, sicine hoc te mi facere! Pseud.
202, huncine hominem pati colere iuventutem Atticam! Truc. 537,
hoccin mihi ob labores tantos tantillum dari! 933, huncine hominem
te amplexari! And. 245, adeon hominem esse invenustum! 253, tan-
tamne rem tam neclegenter agere! 425, nullane in re esse quoiquam
fidem! 689, sicine me sollicitari! 716, nilne esse proprium quoiquam!
H. T. 751, illancine mulierem alere! 921, tene istuc loqui! Eun. 225,
adeon homines inmutarier! 553, neminemne curiosum intervenire!
Phor. 339, tene asymbolum venire unctum! 497, adeon ingenio esse

duro te! 499, adeon te esse incogitantem! 810, itan parvam mihi
fidem esse! 977, tantane adfectum quemquam esse hominem audacia!
Hec. 532, adeon pervicaci esse animo! Ad. 38, vah! quemquamne
hominem in animo instituere! 237, hocine incipere Aeschinum!
390, haecine fieri! 408, haecine flagitia facere te! haec te admittere;
610b, hocine mali obici tantum! Enn. Trag. 47, men obesse, illos
prodesse; me obstare, illos obsequi! Cato, fr. Jord. 41, 5, eane fieri
bonis! With *nonne:* Trin. 1046, nonne hoc publice animum
advorti!

2) Perfect Tense: Asin. 226, haecine te esse oblitum; Bacch.
283, adeon me fuisse fungum, ut crederem! 628, criminin me habu-
isse fidem! 1090, hocine me aetatis ludos bis factum esse indigne!
Curc. 589, sicine mihi esse os oblitum; M. G. 488, meamne hospitam
tractatam et ludificatam! Pseud. 371, ten amatorem esse inventum
inanem! Trin. 1017, tribusne te poteriis memoriam esse oblitum!
And. 609, servon fortunas meas me commisisse! H. T. 980, adeon rem
rediisse! so Phor. 153; Eun. 360, numquamne me illam vidisse!
644, hocine tam audax facinus facere esse ausum! Phor. 466, itane te
hinc abisse et vitam tuam tutandam aliis dedisse! Ad. 449, ex illan
familia tam inliberale facinus esse ortum! Pacuv. 40, men servasse,
ut essent qui me perderent!

An examination of the foregoing material shows that the infini-
tive of exclamation is used almost exclusively in expressions of
disgust, contempt, and regret. In only a single instance do we have
an expression of satisfaction: Asin. 580, edepol senem Demaenetum
lepidum fuisse! In Eun. 209, ah! rogitare, quasi difficile sit, the
feeling is one of mild reproach.

It is noteworthy that Terence makes much freer use of the
construction than Plautus. In the six plays of Terence there are
nearly twice as many instances of the usage as in all the plays of
Plautus.

INFINITIVE IN TITLES.

Here belong such uses as in Cato, Agr. 115, 2, vinum ad alvom
movendam concinnare; 122, vinum concinnare, si lotium difficilius
transibit; 128, habitationem delutare.

TENSES OF THE INFINITIVE.

PRESENT INFINITIVE.

Present for Future.

The use of the present infinitive with future force is somewhat common in Early Latin, especially with verbs whose meaning involves a reference to future time, as verbs of hoping, promising, swearing, vowing, threatening, etc. The usage is doubtless influenced by the free use of the present indicative with future force. The frequency with which the subject of the accusative is omitted in this use is noteworthy. Examples :

adiuro: Cist. 583, se adiurat mihi monstrare.

adnuo: Enn. Ann. 87, adnuvit sese mecum decernere ferro.

aio: Pseud. 1118, aibat arcessere; Capt. 586, quod redimere se ait; Asin. 442; And. 353, ait tibi uxorem dare hodie.

arbitror: Amph. 675, me meum officium facere, si huic eam advorsum, arbitror.

audio: And. 534, ex te auditum aibant filiam meam nubere tuo gnato.

autumo: Most. 1132, pro te ire autumo.

censeo: Aul. 528, aes censet dari.

denego: Stich. 558, denegavit dare se; H. T. 487, dare denegaris.

dico: Asin. 366, dixit sese operam dare; 394, ire dixit; Capt. 194, quo ire dixeram; Cas. 479, se locum dixit dare; Merc. 419; 467; M. G. 229; 231; Poen. 529; Trin. 736; And. 411, si te dices ducere; Eun. 793; Phor. 532; Ad. 203; Pacuv. 167.

interminor: Pseud. 778, interminatus est eum perbitere.

iuro: Rud. 1379, iuratust mihi dare; Poen. 361, liberare me iuravisti; Pers. 401.

minor: Stich. 21, quod facere minatur; Men. 842, minatur mihi oculos exurere.

nego: Cas. 698, negat ponere; Pers. 432, te negabas credere argentum mihi; Rud. 1292, ei dari negatis? Stich. 393; And. 379, si tu negaris ducere.

polliceor: Men. 311, pollicitu's dare; Most. 1084; 1086; And. 613, qui sum pollicitus ducere.

promitto : Bacch. 920, quos dare promisi militi ; so also 969a; Cas. 288; Cist. 542; Merc. 631, promittebas te os sublinere patri; Rud. 777, promisimus talentum sistere; Trin. 5.

repromitto : Curc. 667, repromisit reddere.

scio : Most. 17, te in pistrinum scis actutum tradier.

spero : Truc. 936, si hanc tecum esse speras; Rud. 636, ut esse speres virgidemiam ; 589 ; Eun. 520, sperat se a me avellere; Hec. 147, sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

voveo : Curc. 72, me inferre vovi ; 181, pervigilare te vovisti.

Dependent on context : Amph. 206, si velint rapta tradere, abituros agro, pacem dare illis.

The foregoing verbs also govern the future infinitive, as may be seen by the material cited at p. 367 ff.

WITH *MEMINI.*

Memini is regularly construed with the present infinitive of personal experience, as in the classical period. See the examples cited at p. 374 f.

Use of the Perfect Infinitive.

Perfect Infinitive with Force of Present.

The perfect infinitive occurs with the force of the present, especially with verbs of wishing, and the perfect indicative of expressions having the force of 'it was fitting' (*oportuit, decuit, aequom fuit*, etc.). With expressions of the latter type, the perfect seems to be the result of a striving to bring out more clearly the reference to the past (Ziemer, Junggrammatische Streifzüge, p. 76). With verbs of wishing, it is possible that we have a survival of the aoristic force of the tense (Delbrück, Vgl. Synt. ii, p. 473).

aequom fuit : Bacch. 1017, prius cavisse ergo quam pudere aequom fuit ; M. G. 730, itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequom fuit.

cupio : Asin. 901, perisse (eam) cupio.

decuit : Naev. Com. 22, suopte utrosque decuit acceptos cibo.

expeto : Hec. 727, me nunc conventam esse expetit ; Pacuv. 206, me esse adiutam expetunt.

nolo: Poen. 872, noli devellisse (sc. alas).

operae pretium est: Most. 842, latius demumst operae pretium ivisse.

oportuit: Amph. 944, cavisse oportuit; Aul. 754, non attactam oportuit; Bacch. 759, iam bibisse oportuit; 819; Cas. 766, cenam iam esse coctam oportuit; Cist. 574, exquisisse oportuit; 584, at non missam oportuit; Epid. 11, quam te iam diu perdidisse oportuit; Men. 194, oportebat nasum abreptam mordicus; 995, iam sublimen raptum oportuit; M. G. 1336; Poen. 526; Stich. 130, non datas oportuit; Trin. 1092; Truc. 510, aliquid actum oportuit; Merc. 724, dictum oportuit; Most. 1093, factum oportuit; Pers. 448; Stich. 354; Trin. 416; And. 238, nonne oportuit praescisse me? nonne communicatum oportuit? H. T. 200, mansum tamen oportuit; 247, non oportuit relictas; 635; Eun. 981, oportuit rem praenarrasse me; Ad. 214, adulescenti morem gestum oportuit; Stat. 9, gratulatum med oportebat prius (MSS. me oporteat); Afran. 17.

opus est: Stich. 232, haec veniisse iam opus est.

possum: Aul. 828, non potes probasse nugas; Merc. 596; iam a portu rediisse potuit.

volo: Poen. 1119, est qui illum conventam esse volt; Pseud. 905, si quemquam di voluere esse adiutum; 906, tum me et Calidorum servatum volunt esse et lenonem exstinctum; Rud. 1193, si esse bene factum volunt; Stich. 127, esse ambas conventas volo; And. 510, opinionem hanc esse amotam volo; H. T. 978, rogasse vellem; Hec. 563, interdico ne extulisse extra aedes puerum velis! Cato, Agr. 5, 4, nequid emisse velit, neu quid dominum celavisse velit; haruspicem ne consuluisse velit; fr. Jord. 47, 16, domi quom auspicamus, honorem me divom velim habuisse; CIL, 1, 196, 4, habuisse velet; so 11; 7, adiese velet; 12, fecise velit; so 15, 16, 20; 13, coniourase, comvovise, conspondise, compromesise velet; 14, dedise velet; 21, arfuise velent.

Corresponding to the use of the perfect indicative of *sum* in the sense 'is no longer', 'has perished,' we find occasionally also the perfect infinitive similarly used: Capt. 243, di animum ostenderunt suom ut qui erum me tibi fuisse velint ('wish me no longer to be your master'); 516, me fuisse mavelim, 'I wish I were dead'; Bacch. 151, vixisse nimio satiust quam vivere.

CHAPTER VIII.

PARTICIPLES, GERUND, AND SUPINE, ETC.

PARTICIPLES.

The Present Active Participle.[1]

THERE exists unfortunately a great confusion of nomenclature in treating of the different uses of the Latin participle. Some, as Gustafsson and Tammelin, divide all uses into appositive and predicative. Others, as Schmalz, Synt., p. 453, recognize attributive and predicative uses. The latest work on the participle, that of Sidey, has nothing to say of either attributive or appositive uses, but classifies as follows: 1. Participles with true participial force; 2. Participles used predicatively, so that apparently a predicative use, as Bacch. 204, exeuntem me aspexisti, is not to be regarded as an illustration of a participle with true participial force. Various other grammarians omit all reference to attributive, appositive, and predicative uses.

Even among those who recognize predicative uses there is not entire agreement as to the definition of the term. Thus Schmalz, Synt., p. 456, regards Cist. 123, quae hinc flens abiit, as an illustration of the predicate use (justly so in my judgment), while Tammelin brings it under another head. Yet when Schmalz brings under the predicative uses Rud. 71, vehemens sum exoriens; Men. 951, at ego te pendentem fodiam stimulis; Amph. 437, iniurato plus credet mihi quam iurato tibi; Cas. 510, iam victi vicimus, he is, I think, using the term at variance with the meaning attached to it by most investigators.

We may, I believe, with good reason distinguish three different general types of participial uses:

[1] Tammelin, De participiis priscae Latinitatis, 1889; Sidey, The Participle in Plautus, Petronius, and Apuleius, 1909; Schmalz, Syntax und Stilistik[4], p. 449 ff.

1. The attributive use, where the participle limits the substantive directly, as 'boiling water'; *aqua fervens;* 'kochendes Wasser.'

2. The appositive use, in which the relation of the participle to its substantive is analogous to that of a noun in the appositive relation, as *Marcus subito adveniens me ibi invenit;* 'Marcus, suddenly arriving, found me there'; 'plötzlich ankommend fand er mich da.'

3. The predicative use, in which the main predication is found in the participle, as *flens abiit;* 'he departed weeping'; 'er ging weinend fort'; *rediit triumphans;* 'he returned in triumph'; 'er kehrte als Triumphator zurück.'

We shall have to consider also the participle used as adjective and as substantive.

ATTRIBUTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

The attributive use of the present participle is not frequent. Examples are: Bacch. 478, ut in gremio osculantem mulierem teneat sedens; Liv. And. Trag. 26, ego puerum ancillae subdam lactantem meae; Enn. Trag. 30, lunata micans Diana facem iacit a laeva; 316, neque sanguis ullo potis pacto profluens consistere; Acc. 397, vel globosos turbines exsistere ictos undis concursantibus; 401, undante in freto; Stat. 214, ab amico amante argentum accipere meretrix non volt; Enn. Ann. 194, 13, suavis homo, facundus . . . secunda loquens in tempore . . . multa tenens antiqua sepulta; 200, pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis; 231, milia militum octo duxit delectos, bellum tolerare potentes; 288, 5, semper adundantes hastas frangit; 298, eripuere patres pueris plorantibus offam; Cato, Agr. 156, 7, in aquam ferventem.

APPOSITIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

These are the most numerous uses of the participle, and express various relations, such as circumstances or situation, means, time, cause, or the adversative relation ('concession'), etc.

1. Circumstances or situation.

a) Nominative: Amph. 623, vigilans vidi, vigilans nunc te video, vigilans fabulor; 256, ad nos veniunt flentes; Asin. 593, abiens offers morbum; Aul. 6, obsecrans concredidit auri thensaurum; 7,

in medio foco defodit, venerans me ut id servarem; 727, quinam
homo eiulans conqueritur maerens? Bacch. 48, sedens opperibere;
361, adveniens nomen mutabit mihi; Capt. 914, adveniens deturbavit
totum cum carni carnarium; Cas. 664, omnes sub arcis, sub lectis
latentes metu mussitant; 932, profugiens exeo hoc ornatu quo vides;
Cist. 291, astans somnias; Curc. 338, saluto adveniens; Pers. 1, qui
amans egens ingressus est princeps in Amoris vias; Poen. 261, quid
hic malum astans opstipuisti? Liv. And. Trag. 12, ipsus se in ter-
ram saucius fligit cadens; Enn. Trag. 212, numquam era errans mea
domo ecferret pedem Medea; Pacuv. 71, cum incultos pervestigans
rimarem sinus; 158, te lacerabo et fatigans artus distraham; Acc.
192, hostem ut profugiens inimicis invadam in manus; Enn. Com.
3, mulier lacrimans ad genua accidit; Liv. And. Od. 19 utrum genua
amplectens oraret; 20, ibi manens sedeto; Enn. Ann. 28, 2, talia tum
memorat lacrumans; 55, 1, cum cura magna curantes, tum cupientes
regni dant operam auspicio; Lucil. 478, quaenam vox ex tecto
resonans meo gradu remoram facit? 651, huc praeteriens venit;
Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 11, 3, ut se ipsa stans sustinere non possit; 25,
3, Rhodienses superbos esse aiunt, id obiectantes.

b) Genitive: Asin. 591, quia tui amans abeuntis egeo; Hec. 517,
nam audivisse vocem pueri visust vagientis.

c) Dative: Amph. 703, Bacchae bacchanti si velis advorsarier;
Bacch. 233, unde aurum ecficiam amanti erili filio; Cas. 63, ei dat
operam absenti; Cist. 84, gessit morem oranti mihi; Curc. 149,
gerite amanti mihi morem; Poen. 614, iam nunc illic egredienti
sanguinem exsugam; Stich. 512, et magis par fuerat me vobis dare
cenam advenientibus; And. 359, redeunti interea ex ipsa re mi
incidit suspicio; H. T. 31, qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via de-
cesse populum; Ad. 693, quid? credebas dormienti haec tibi con-
fecturos deos? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 47, 19, si cui ancillae dormienti
evenit; Pacuv. 215, repugnanti ego porro hunc vi detraxi ungulum.

d) Accusative: Amph. 701, huc nos dormientis detulit; Cas.
1003, nulla causast quin pendentem me verberes; Cist. 659 (eam)
iacentem sustuli; Pseud. 1247, an id voltis, ut me hinc iacentem
aliquis tollat? Most. 330; Stich. 765, stantem stanti savium dare
amicam amico; And. 414, nunc hunc venientem sequor; Phor. 520,
te tuli, pollicitantem et nil ferentem; Acc. 60, ut me depositum et

maerentem nuntio repentino alacrem reddidisti! Liv. And. 20, donicum videbis me carpento vehentem en domum venisse.

e) Ablative: Pseud. 3, si ex te tacente fieri possem certior.

2. **Means:** Asin. 291, loquens lacerat diem; 709, ut cruciere currens; Men. 922, occidis fabulans; Merc. 56, ea quae omnis labores invenisset perferens; Rud. 26, a dis supplicans inveniet veniam sibi; Trin. 680, tu obiurgans me a peccatis rapis deteriorem in viam.

3. **Time,** chiefly with *adveniens, abiens,* etc.

a) Nominative: Aul. 303, ne quid animae forte amittat dormiens; Epid. 90, fidicinam quam abiens mandavit mihi; M. G. 179, abiens ita respondit; Most. 1103, nimio plus sapio sedens; Poen. 692, adveniens irem in carcerem; Rud. 71, vehemens sum exoriens, quom occido vehementior; Stich. 406, olim quos abiens adfeci aegrimonia; And. 284, iam ferme moriens me vocat; Eun. 830, istucine interminata sum hinc abiens tibi? Phor. 758, offendi adveniens conlocatam gnatam; Ad. 457, ille tibi moriens nos commendavit senex; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 15, 10, ensem quem abiens reliquisse dicitur; 15, 5, Aurunci primum possederunt, inde Achaei Troia domum redeuntes.

b) Dative: Bacch. 198, non impetratum id advenienti redderem? 769; Capt. 1004, haec mihi advenienti upupa datast; Most. 430, unde advenienti sarcinam imponam seni; Poen. 1151; Trin. 869; Ad. 92, hoc advenienti quod mihi dixere!

c) Accusative: Amph. 706, quae me advenientem noluerit salutare; 711; 714; 978; Bacch. 101, bene me accipies advenientem; Hec. 237, quod heri nemo voluit visentem ad eam te intro admittere.

4. **Cause:** Amph. 1112, ego cunas recessim rursum vorsum trahere et ducere, metuens pueris, mihi formidans; M. G. 1164, quasi ex hoc matrimonio abierim, cupiens istius nuptiarum; Rud. 560, signum amplexae tenent, nescio quid metuentes; 274, nunc tibi amplectimur genua egentes opum; And. 585, idque adeo metuens vos celavi; Eun. 133, pretium sperans ilico producit; Hec. 601, quam fortunatus sum hanc matrem habens talem!

5. **Adversative relation:** Asin. 290, quid ego hic properans concesso pedibus? Acc. 626.

6. **With adverbial force:** Amph. 661, me temptat sciens? Asin. 568, ubi sciens infidus fueris; so 562; Bacch. 569, loqueris nugas nunc

sciens; Cas. 63; 675; 979; and frequently; Cas. 809, lubens fecero et solens; and often; Capt. 50, ignorans suo sibi servit patri; Rud. 367, properans exsolvi restim.

PREDICATE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

1. Nominative: Amph. 256, ad nos veniunt flentes; 290, cum Alcumena cubat amans; Bacch. 22, qui annos xx errans a patria afuit; 109, te sequor exspectans quas res geras; Cist. 123, flens abiit; so 132; 192; 567, amplexa est genua plorans, obsecrans; M. G. 201, adstitit severo fronte curans, cogitans; Acc. 417, cuius aditum exspectans pervixi usque adhuc; Naev. Bell. Pun. 4, exibant flentes; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), 2, 9, iterum triumphans endo urbem Romam rediit; so also CIL, i, 541; Enn. Ann. 177, Illyrii restant sicis sibunisque fodentes; 234, aspectabat virtutem legionis suai exspectans si mussaret; Sat. 478, advenis . . . lupino escam impetu petens.

2. Accusative. This occurs especially with verbs of seeing, perceiving, etc., and with verbs of making. Examples: Bacch. 451, quem astantem video; Cas. 354, videre ardentem te; Cist. 547, vidi exeuntem mulierem; Curc. 277, parasitum tuom currentem video; Merc. 598, quem currentem video; M. G. 320, quam vidisse aibas te osculantem atque amplexantem; 1136; Rud. 163, mulierculas video sedentis; Asin. 878, si accubantem virum conspexeris; Bacch. 204, me exeuntem aspexisti; Epid. 435, quis illic est quem huc advenientem conspicor? Merc. 109, currentem servom conspicor; Bacch. 859, nihil est quod mavelim quam illum cubantem opprimere; Rud. 387, sedentem flentemque opprimes; Amph. 1098, uxorem tuam neque gementem neque plorantem audivimus; Most. 934; And. 838, egomet vidi iurgantem ancillam; Hec. 806, quid Bacchidem exeuntem video? Ad. 305; And. 84, observabam servolos venientis aut abeuntis; H. T. 285, texentem telam studiose ipsam offendimus; 366; Turp. 74, aspexit virginem ibi stantem; Amph. 529, lacrumantem concinnas uxorem; 789, haec nos delirantis facere dictis postulat; 1030, quem ego faciam ferventem flagris; Asin. 48, propterea quod me non scientem feceris; Men. 444, dicto me emit audientem, haud imperatorem sibi; H. T. 873, nam te scientem faciam; Eun. 36.

3. Ablative Absolute. This also is a predicate use of the parti-

ciple. The construction has a very limited range in Early Latin, occurring chiefly in the case of *praesens* and *absens.* Examples: Amph. 749, me quidem praesente numquam factumst; Cas. 423, praesente hoc plura verba fieri non desidero; Bacch. 263; H. T. 1042, pudet dicere hac praesente; Hec. 674; Eun. 1059; Acc. 428, praesente his; yet illis praesentibus in Bacch. 301; Amph. 827, teque absente hic munus fungatur tuom; 811; Phor. 258, bonas me absente hic confecistis nuptias; Eun. 649, absente nobis; so Afran. 6; but Stich. 131 and elsewhere *illisce absentibus.* At Amph. 400 the MSS. have *nobis praeter me;* Nonius, *nobis praesente.* Other verbs are less frequent: Amph. 747, etiam adstante hoc Sosia; 998, hic deludetur vobis inspectantibus; Asin. 403, quassanti capite incedit; so Bacch. 305; Men. 272, me lubente feceris; M. G. 144, sene sciente hoc feci; Poen. 322, nam vigilante Venere si veniant; H. T. 913, se vidente; Eun. 956, conligavit? :: et quidem orante Thaide; Hec. 830, eum haec cognovit Myrrina in digito modo me habente; Ad. 507, non me indicente haec fiunt; Enn. Trag. 59, qui te sic tractavere nobis respectantibus; Pacuv. 411, occidente sole inhorrescit mare; Enn. Ann. 327, pereunte viro raucus sonus aere cucurrit.

ADJECTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

It is not always easy to distinguish between the adjective and participial use. The following are among the clearest examples of genuine adjective uses: Capt. 912, lupus esuriens; so Poen. 6; 31; Rud. 3, sum splendens candida stella; Ad. 761, senex delirans; Bacch. 459, opsequens oboediensque est; Asin. 620, oculi sunt lacrumantes; Cato, Agr. 142, domino dicto audiens sit; Prooem. 4, minime male cogitantes sunt. Most of the examples cited under this head by Tammelin, op. cit. p. 28 ff., seem to me to be illustrations of the attributive use of the participle.

SUBSTANTIVE USES OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

Here again there is difficulty in distinguishing with precision whether we have true substantive uses or whether the participial value is to be recognized. In most of the examples cited by Tammelin, op. cit. p. 30 ff. we should probably supply in sense an indefinite pronoun, e.g. Aul. 811, vocem loquentis audire visus sum; Curc. 199,

bene monstrantem pugnis caedis; Rud. 260, vox me precantum huc
foras excitavit; Epid. 112, nihil agit qui diffidentem verbis solatur
suis. Even examples of this type are infrequent. Instances of
genuine substantives are: Truc. 26, quot amans exemplis ludificetur,
where *amans = amator.* So Most. 171, ut lepide ea omnis res tenet
sententiasque amantum; Eun. 232, stulto intellegens quid interest?

Time of the Present Participle.

The present participle, as is well recognized, regularly denotes an
action or state contemporary with that of the verb with which it is
associated. But in a few instances the participle seems to denote a
prior action, e.g. Capt. 9, eumque hinc profugiens vendidit; Truc.
382, sed quod ego facinus audivi adveniens tuom? Less certain
illustrations of the same usage are passages like Amph. 799, adve-
niens ilico me salutavisti; Pseud. 1201, dudum adveniens extemplo
sumbolum servo tuo, where *ilico* and *extemplo* emphasize the practical
identity of time between the action of the verb and the participle.
Very likely the same feeling was present in Pers. 731, transcidi loris
omnis adveniens domi, and other passages without *ilico* or any similar
word, as Bacch. 361; Poen. 601; Eun. 458.

In general it is to be noted that in Early Latin the present parti-
ciple is not used with the freedom with which it is employed later
It is confined likewise to a very limited number of verbs, of which
advenio is by far the most important. As may be seen by the fore-
going examples, plural uses are relatively much rarer than those of
the singular.

The Future Active Participle.

The only examples of this (apart from the employment of the
future active participle in the periphrastic conjugation) are: Asin.
634, Diabolus ipsi daturus dixit (probably a Grecism), and C. Grac-
chus (Meyer), p. 232, qui prodeunt dissuasuri.

The Perfect Passive Participle.[1]

Some Peculiarities in Tense and Voice Function.

1. The perfect participle of deponents often denotes not a prior, but a
simultaneous, action, e.g. Amph. 290, qui complexus cum Alcumena

[1] Brugmann, Die mit dem Suffix *-to* gebildeten Partizipia im Verbalsystem des
Lateinischen, Indog. Forschungen, V, p. 89 ff.

cubat; Asin. 640, suavius complexos fabulari; Rud. 560, signum
flentes amplexae tenent; so 695, nixae; 1203; Phor. 315, patris ais
conspectum veritum hinc abisse.

2. The perfect participle of deponents occasionally has passive force,
e.g. Asin. 196, ubi illaec quae dedi ante? : : abusa; M. G. 903, probe
meditatam utramque duco; so also Pers. 465; 466; Pseud. 941;
1204; Trin. 817; M. G. 1103, sororem adesse et matrem dicito,
quibus concomitata deveniat domum; Eun. 384, nos nostramque
adulescentiam habent despicatam; so also Cas. 189.

**3. A few verbs, not otherwise used in the passive, form a perfect pas-
sive participle having active or neuter meaning,** e.g. Poen. 736, ex-
templo denegabit. :: iuratus quidem; Pseud. 792; Rud. 48; Pacuv.
33, iurati cernant; Epid. 144, ante occasum solem; so also Men. 437;
1022; Lucil. 55, quae sublata omnia sunt sole occaso obductoque; 744,
quom bene potus recessit; Cael. Antip. (Peter), 104, 3, custodibus
discessis multi interficiuntur; Pseud. 996, novi; notis (= eis qui
norunt) praedicas. This usage is an Indo-European inheritance. In
Indo-European the verbal in *-tos* was not restricted to either voice,
but was used freely now with active, now with passive, force. The
Greek verbal in -τός similarly often shows active meanings.

ATTRIBUTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

Examples: Capt. 1006, exoptate gnate; Curc. 306, Curculio
exoptate; Capt. 1020, meritam mercedem dabo; Enn. Trag. 209,
in ea delecti viri vecti petebant pellem inauratam; 389, bene facta
male locata; Pacuv. 238, atque eccum in ipso tempore ostentum!
Acc. 381, reprime vim citatum quadrupedum; 395, interruptum
nimbum; 678, splendida mundi sidera binis continuis sex picti
spoliis.

APPOSITIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

The perfect participle in its appositive use does not show the
same clear equivalence to various types of subordinate clauses
(temporal, causal, adversative, etc.) as we noted in the case of the
present participle. Nor is there the same variety in case use.
Ordinarily we find only the nominative and accusative. The fol-
lowing examples, therefore, are presented without any attempt at

classification: Bacch. 271, damnatus demum, vi coactus reddidit cc
Philippum; Capt. 145, expertus quanti fuerit, desidero; Cas. 628,
ne quid in te mali faxit ira percita; 855, acceptae bene eximus;
Cist. 202, ut vobis victi Poeni poenas sufferant; 224, neque mihi
ulla abest perdito permities; 729, folio intorta implicat se; And. 780,
coactus legibus eam uxorem ducet; Eun. 178, labascit victus uno
verbo; Phor. 469, ne quid propter tuam fidem decepta poteretur
mali; Naev. Com. 101, sedens in cella circumtectus tegetibus pinxit;
Stat. 26, ea tum compressa parit huic puerum; Turp. 8, non ago hoc
per sagam pretio conductam; Afran. 245, occasionem nancta mulier
involat in collum; Enn. Ann. 28, 13, haec ecfatus repente recessit;
Lucil. 339, Carpathium mare transvectus cenabis Rhodi.   At times
the participle is equivalent to a relative clause: Cist. 124, parvolam
puellam proiectam sustuli; so Cist. Arg. 5, eam sublatam meretrix
alii detulit. Followed by a predicative accusative: Cas. Arg. 6, ducit
civem Casinam cognitam; so also Cist. Arg. 10.   Sometimes the
participle is equivalent to a coördinate clause, as: Enn. Trag. 355,
extemplo acceptam me necato; Acc. 70, amplexa, fructum quem di
dant cape!

PREDICATE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

1. **Nominative.**   Many of the uses classed by Tammelin as apposi-
tive seem to me to belong under the head of predicate uses, e.g. Epid.
691, ego solutus adsto; Capt. 330, filius meus apud vos servit captus;
Cas. 540, ornata exspectat domi.   In all of these the essential thing
predicated is expressed by the participle.   Other examples are: Aul.
721a, male perditus, pessume ornatus eo; Bacch. 298, eo exanimatus
fui; 349, ille est oneratus; Capt. 891, iterum natus videor; 447, tua
huc ornatus reveniam ex sententia; Cas. 768 candide vestitus, lautus
exornatusque ambulat; Curc. 289, qui incedunt suffarcinati; And.
909, itan huc paratus advenis? H. T. 391, desertae vivimus; Acc.
255, crines propessi (*de conj.*) iacent; Enn. Trag. 78, arae fractae et
disiectae iacent; Pacuv. 232, exspectata advenis; Enn. Ann. 330,
nisi victus fatetur (a Grecism).

2. **Accusative:**

a) Miscellaneous expressions: Bacch. 750, vinctum te adservet;
Bacch. 935, has tabellas consignatas quas fero; Capt. 205, si solutos

sinat; 351, mittam istunc aestumatum; so 364; 379; 446, satin habes, mandata quae sunt facta si refero? Stich. 132, vosne patiar cum mendicis nuptas viris?

b) Verbs of seeing, etc. Cas. 922, ubi saltum video obsaeptum; Cist. 298, video ego te amoris valde tactum toxico; Pseud. 163, haec facite ut offendam parata; And. 234, quidnam Pamphilum exanimatum video? H. T. 426, sed ipsum foras egressum video; Hec. 325, quo modo nunc te offendam adfectam? Stat. 225, te suffarcinatam vidi.

c) Verbs of making:

Facio (especially in the phrase *missum facio*): Amph. 1145, missum facio Teresiam senem; Merc. 84; 657; 1000, missas ego istas artis feci; Rud. 800, te faxo recte acceptum, ut dignus es; M. G. Arg. 10, impellit omissam faciat concubinam; Lucil. 748; Ad. 906, missa haec face! Hec. 408.

Reddo: Bacch. 198, non impetratum id advenienti ei redderem? 767, tam frictum ego illum reddam; And. 864, ego iam te commotum reddam; Phor. 856; Acc. 60.

Do: Cas. 439, factum et curatum dabo; Cist. 595, perfectum ego hoc dabo negotium; Pseud. 926; And. 683, hoc tibi inventum dabo; Eun. 213; Pacuv. 30, quid me moneris effectum dabo.

Other verbs: Curc. 385, ego hoc effectum lepide tibi tradam; Aul. 695, ut istuc quod me oras impetratum ab eo auferam; Most. 786, adfero omne impetratum; And. 684, inventum tibi curabo et mecum adductum tuom Pamphilum, where *curo* = *reddo*.

d) Volo, cupio, etc.: Bacch. 495, factum volo; 603, dirumptum velim; Capt. 53, vos quod monitos voluerim; Cas. 326, velim dirruptam; Cist. 299, te volo monitum; 704, sunt qui volunt te conventam; Curc. 83, istunc adflictum velim; 103, ibi me sepultam velim; Aul. 677, di me salvom et servatum volunt; Cas. 286, nihil est me cupere factum; 814, di me cupiunt servatum; Curc. 304, te conventum cupit; And. 667, si omnes hunc coniectum in nuptias inimici vellent; Ad. 372, si quid recte curatum velis; 165, nollem factum; Phor. 797, nollem datum.

Despite the fact that we often find the infinitive with these verbs (e.g. Hec. 727, Laches me nunc conventam esse expetit; cf. p. 428), yet I am in agreement with Tammelin, p. 77 ff., who holds that

unless *esse* is expressed, it is more natural to recognize the simple participle.

e) Habeo,[1] teneo, etc. Several distinct types of usage fall under this head:

Habeo, 'keep,' in the literal sense: Merc. 360, nequiquam apscondidi, abstrusam habebam; M. G. 1334, capita inter se nimis nexa habent; Rud. 748, liberos parentibus sublectos habebis? Trin. 909, non placet qui amicos intra dentes conclusos habet; Phor. 744, conclusam hic habeo uxorem saevam.

Habeo, 'keep,' in transferred sense: Bacch. 26, quae sodalem atque me exercitos habet; Epid. 529, aerumna exercitam med habet; M. G. 564, hominem servom suos domitos habere oportet oculos; Men. 801; Pers. 856; CIL, i, 198, 18, discriptos habeto.

Habeo despicatam = despicor: Cas. 189, vir me habet despicatam; so Eun. 384; Bacch. 572, neque tu me habebis falso suspectum; Cato, Agr. 5, 6, boves maxima diligentia curatos habeto (= curato); Pseud. 602, illa omnia missa habeo (= mitto); Stich. 362, res omnis relictas habeo (= relinquo).

Habeo, 'regard,' Poen. 542, per iocum dictum habeto.

Habeo with the perfect participle has the force of the present perfect: Cist. 319, hasce aedis conductas habet; Bacch. 550, quod in se fuit, accuratum habuit; Men. 583, qui aut faenore aut periuriis habent rem paratam; M. G. 885, multos saepe vidi regionem fugere consili prius quam repertam haberent; Poen. 594, ccc nummos numeratos habet; Trin. 838, satis partum habeo; Hec. 582, tuos pater narravit modo quo pacto me habueris praepositam amori tuo; 751, pollicerer tibi, segregatum (sc. me) habuisse a me Pamphilum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 77, 2, quid exquisitum habeam.

Examples of similar verbs: Amph. 341, tu qui Volcanum in cornu conclusum geris; Rud. 1144, o mei parentes, hic vos conclusos gero; Bacch. 181, me vadatum amore vinctumque attines; Truc. 837, testis vinctos attines.

f) With *opus est, usus est.*

Opus est, e.g. Bacch. 398, obvigilatost opus; Merc. 466, cauto opust; Most. 902; Men. 592, minus quam opus fuerat dicto; Hec. 431, in arcem transcurso opus est; H. T. 80; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 37, 13, non opus est

---

[1] Thielmann, Archiv für lat. Lexikog. ii, p. 372 ff.; 509 ff.

recitato; Stich. 61, quod opus facto; Merc. 330, hoc nunc mihi viso opust; Phor. 762, nunc quid opus facto sit vide; Pacuv. 35; Bacch. 219; Cato, Agr. 2, 6, quae opus sint locato; Cas. 502, nam mihi vicino hoc etiam convento est opus; Curc. 302, hoc homine convento est opus; 322, illis conventis opus est; Pseud. 732, sed quinque inventis opus est argenti minis; Hec. 664, videte iam remissan opus sit vobis, redductan domum; 104; 866.

Usus est: Cist. 129, tacere nequeo quod tacito usus est; Trin. 503, ubi usus nil erat dicto; Asin. 312, nunc audacia usust nobis inventa et dolis; Hec. 327, non usus factost mihi nunc hunc intro sequi; 878; Ad. 429, moneo quid facto usus sit.

3. Ablative Absolute. With the perfect participle the ablative absolute construction has a greater range of use than the present participle. The present participle is confined to a very few verbs, while the perfect is employed in a considerable variety. Examples: Amph. 967, evoca Blepharonem, qui re divina facta mecum prandeat; Capt. 82, item parasiti rebus prolatis latent; And. 923, Atticus quidam olim navi fracta ad Andrum eiectus est; Ad. 286, ego iam transacta re convortam me domum; Naev. Trag. 16, passo velo vicinum in portum fer; Enn. Ann. 194, 5, consilio lato indu foro sanctoque senatu; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), 1, 7, ea pugna pugnata; Acc. 548, abiecta gloria; Pacuv. 200, neu reliquias meas sireis denudatis ossibus per terram divexarier; 347, pastor exorto iubare, noctis decurso itinere; Lucil. 55, quae sublata omnia sunt sole occaso obductoque; CIL, i, 541, Corinto deleto.

ADJECTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

Besides the familiar *doctus, mortuos, perditus, meritus, transvorsus,* there is little to cite. In M. G. 7, quia se iam pridem feriatam gestitem, *feriatam* is fairly adjective in character. So also Acc. 461, abstruso in flumine; 314, probis probatum potius quam multis fore. But most of the examples given by Tammelin, p. 51 ff., and Sidey, p. 4 f., seem to me rather to illustrate real participles used attributively.

SUBSTANTIVE USES OF THE PERFECT PARTICIPLE.

According to Brugmann, Indog. Forsch. V, p. 140, this use in the neuter is Indo-European. Brugmann recognizes two categories of

such Indo-European neuter uses of the *-to* verbal: (1) The verbal indicates an event or state; (2) It indicates something connected in some way with the act or state as subject or predicate. Besides neuters we also have masculines and feminines used substantively. In addition to the common *dicta, facta, mandata, promissa, optata, praecepta,* we find: Men. 979, nimio edo lubentius molitum quam molitum praehibeo; Aul. 430, quid curas utrum crudumne an coctum edim? Most. 1000, vidi efferri mortuom; Poen. 880, doctus; Ad. 751, nova nupta eadem haec discet; Curc. 37; Enn. Ann. 194, 15, multa tenens antiqua sepulta. Especially in prepositional phrases: *de audito, ex audito, ex occulto,* as Pacuv. 185, sermonem nostrum ex occulto clepsit; Trag. Incert. 158, praeter rogitatum si hisces.

SPECIAL IDIOMATIC USES OF THE PARTICIPLE.

Common to both the present and perfect participle is the use whereby a noun or pronoun with a participle is equivalent to a verbal noun with a genitive of the substantive, as, occisus Caesar aliis pessimum videbatur, 'the murder of Caesar.' Examples: Asin. Arg. 6, ob praereptam mulierem; Bacch. 367, super auro amicaque eius inventa; 424, ante solem exorientem; Cas. 84, post transactam fabulam; Cist. 686 (ea) perdita perdidit me, 'its loss has ruined me'; Epid. 144, ante occasum solem; so also Men. 437; 1022; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 80, 10, ob rem bene gestam; CIL, i, 577, 1, ab colonia deducta anno xc.

THE GERUNDIVE.[1]

The origin and primitive force of the gerundive are shrouded in obscurity. Some think it was originally active; others passive.[2]

---

[1] Krause, De gerundii et gerundivi apud antiquissimos Romanos scriptores usu, 1875; Adrian, Ueber den lat. Part. Praesens passivum, 1875; Kvicala, Syntaktische Untersuchungen, II, Gerundium und Gerundivum, Wiener Studien, ii, p. 218 ff.; Platner, Gerund and Gerundive in Plautus and Terence, Am. Jour. Phil. XIV, p. 483 ff.; Weisweiler, Das lat. Partic. Fut. Passivi, 1890; Lebreton, Mémoires de la Soc. de Linguistique, xi, p. 145 ff.; Herkenrath, De gerundii et gerundivi apud Plautum et Cyprianum usu, 1894; Dosson, De participii gerundivi antiquissima vi, 1887; Bayard, De gerundivi et gerundii vi antiquissima, 1902; Gustafsson, De gerundiis et gerundivis Latinis (Eranos V), 1904; Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.⁴, p. 449 ff.

[2] Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 608, calls it medio-passive, citing *oriendus, secundus,* etc.

Some regard it as present; others as future. In Early Latin certainly its force is almost invariably future and passive. Weisweiler defines it as denoting "eine zu vollziehende Tätigkeit," which accords well with the earliest usage. Whether the gerund or the gerundive is the earlier, is still unsettled. In Early Latin the gerund is more frequent than the gerundive, though that circumstance is, of course, not decisive.

1. The gerundive as adjective: *caedundus*, 'fit to be killed,' 'tender': Capt. 819, qui locant caedundos agnos, 'who contract (to furnish) tender lambs'; Aul. 567, caedundum conduxi illum, 'I contracted that he should be tender'; in a different sense: Cas. 528, caedundus tu homo es; *expetendus:* Pers. 521, forma expetenda virginem; Phor. 1024, an mea forma magis expetendast? *oriundus:* Poen. 1055: inde sum oriundus; *mirandus:* Rud. 345, haud miranda facta dicis; *pudendus:* Truc. 269, pudendumst vero clurinum pecus; Trag. Inc. 63, pudendam hortabar fugam; *animum advortendus:* And. 767, o facinus animum advortendum; *miserandus:* Phor. 1008, facinus miserandum; *volvendus:* Enn. Ann. 386, clamor volvendus per aethera vagit; *cupiendus:* Enn. Trag. 256, stultus est qui non cupienda cupiens cupienter cupit; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), p. 42, 8, quae neque fanda neque legenda audivimus. In these last two the adjective is used substantively.

2. The gerundive as participle in the nominative: M. G. 891, quom venit nobis faciundum utrumque; Ad. 337, hoc proferundum tibi videtur? Afran. 111, datur mihi custodiendus.

3. The genitive of the gerundive.

a) Dependent on nouns.

caput: Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.), i, 10, caput patrandae pacis.

causa: Capt. 889, liberorum quaerundorum causa; Eun. 620, retinendi illius causa; Enn. Trag. 97, liberum quaesundum causa; Ann. 218, causa poliendi agri; Cato, Agr. 140, operis faciundi causa; CIL, i, 200, 51, rei procurandae causa.

copia: Bacch. 487, illius inspectandi copia; Capt. 748, ut mihi eius facias conveniundi copiam; Phor. 176, eius amittendi copia; Merc. 850, date conveniundi eius copiam!

finis: Lucil. 119, 6, quaerendae finem rei scire.

gratia: Enn. Trag. 120, liberorum quaesundum gratia; Pacuv. 43, parentum incertum investigandum gratia.

insolentia: Acc. 275, luminis conspiciendi insolentia.

intercapedo: Turp. 184, intercapedo sumpti faciundi.

locus: H. T. 218, cognoscendi et ignoscendi peccati locus.

potestas: Amph. 638, viri potestas videndi; M. G. 1010, ⟨eius⟩ conveniundi potestas; Truc. 293, potestatem coloris ulli capiendi; And. 541, quoius potestas summa servandi; Phor. 880, potestatem eius adhibendae dari; Pacuv. 220, potestatem inquirendi mei parentis.

spes: Rud. 1145, spes vostrum cognoscendum; Phor. 827, spes huiusce habendae.

tempus: Cato, Agr. 61, 2, tempus oleae serendae.

b) With adjs.: Cato, Agr. Prooem, 3, studiosum rei quaerendae.

c) With prepositions: Cato, Agr. 139, illius sacri coercendi ergo; 141, 3, agri mei lustrandi lustrique faciundi ergo.

With the genitive of the personal pronouns the gerundive does not change for the feminine, but we regularly have the form in *-i*; Truc. 370, tui (fem.) videndi copiast; Hec. 372, eius videndi cupidus; Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 444 f.

4. The dative of the gerundive: Amph. 288, nox scitast exercendo scorto; Asin. 250, argento comparando fingere fallaciam; 252, inveniundo argento fingeres fallaciam; Aul. 148, liberis procreandis uxorem ducere; Merc. 192, armamentis complicandis, componendis studuimus; Stich. 678, lectis sternendis studuimus, munditiis adparandis; Merc. 551, rei tuae quaerundae convenit operam dare; 987, rei agundae operam dare; M. G. 745, serviendae servituti servos instruxi; Most. 288, purpura aetati occultandaest; Pers. 428, referundae linguam natam gratiae; 560, centumplex murus rebus servandis parumst; 689, lucro faciundo auspicavi; Poen. 1189, da diem sospitem rebus mis agundis; Rud. 757, optumum esse operi faciundo corium; 1374, ius iurandum rei servandae, non perdendae conditum est; Trin. 229, utrum aetati agundae arbitrer firmiorem; 365, fictorem probum vitae agundae; Truc. 731, lamentando pausam fecit filio; Hec. 821, his rebus anulus fuit initium inveniundis; Ad. 545, huic esse natum rei, ferundis miseriis; Cato, Agr. 6, 2, ager oleto conserundo bonus; 146, 2, oleae legendae, faciendae; CIL, i, 577, 4, lex parieti faciundo; Crassus (Meyer), 270, patrimonio augendo.

5. The accusative of the gerundive:

a) Limiting an object and indicating the purpose of the action:

With *do*: Asin. 444, quos utendos dedi; 676, hanc mi servandam dedit; 778, spectandum ne quoi anulum det; Aul. 250, te elinguandam; 311, famem utendam; Bacch. 338, aurum servandum; Cist. 166, puellam exponendam; 182; 648; Curc. 603, mater ei utendum (sc. anulum) dederat; Men. 657; 659, pallium utendum; 733, (eam) concinnandam; Merc. 238, quam dederam servandam; M. G. 567, me excruciandum; Pers. 117, nummos utendos; Pers. 127, filiam utendam; 128; 440; Poen. 338, pulchram spectandam dare; 1018; 1302; Rud. 602, scalas utendas; H. T. 629, ei dedi exponendam; 650; 655; Eun. 902, servandum quicquam; Ph. 466, vitam tutandam; Ad. 114, tuom filium dedisti adoptandum mihi; 463; Enn. Trag. 277, auris tibi contra utendas dabo; Frag. (Baehr.) 515; Naev. Com. 78.

With *rogo*: Aul. 96, quae utenda rogant; M. G. 347; Cato, Agr. 5, 3.

With *peto*: Aul. 400, artoptam utendam peto.

Other expressions: Eun. 1087, hunc comedendum vobis propino et deridendum; Pacuv. 192, paedagogandum accipit; Phor. 364, agrum colendum habebat; CIL, i, 200, 25, queiquomque id publicum fruendum habebit; Poen. 646, hunc ad te diripiundum adducimus.

b) The accusative and accompanying gerundive are equivalent to an object clause:

With *loco*: Aul. 251, ut me castrandum loces; 568, loces (eum) efferundum; Pers. 160, praebenda aediles locaverunt; Cato, Agr. 14, 1, villam aedificandam si locabis; 144, 1, oleam legendam locare; 145, 1, oleam faciundam locare. Passive: Cato, Agr. 144, 4, nequis concedat quo olea legunda et faciunda carius locetur; 145, 1, si facienda locata erunt.

With *do*: Curc. 439, statuam volt dare auream solidam faciendam; Men. 541, inauris da mihi faciendas; M. G. 803, si ipsi Soli quaerendas dares; Ad. 585, lectulos faciundos dedit; Cato, Agr. 16, calcem partiario coquendam qui dant.

With *curo*: And. 865, cura adservandum; CIL, i, 1166, haec facienda coiravit; semitas, basilicam calecandam.

c) Accusative of the gerundive with prepositions:

With *ad*: Amph. 669, ad aquam praebendam; Asin. 557, fortior ad sufferendas plagas; Men. 16, ad narrandum argumentum adest

benignitas; Merc. 15, si advortendum ad animum adest benignitas;
M. G. 79, ad enarrandum hoc argumentum est comitas; Poen. 599;
Pseud. 400, neque ad detexundam telam certos terminos; Trin. 232,
plus voluptatis ad aetatem agundam; 646, ad quaerundum honorem;
And. 182, ad disturbandas nuptias; 287, inutiles ad rem tutandam;
H. T. 133, magis ad haec utenda idonea; Phor. 225, ad defendendam
noxiam; 266, ad defendendam causam; Pacuv. 51, quod primordium
capissam ad stirpem exquirendum; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, ad Iovem
optumum maxumum Iunonemque et Minervam ceterosque deos salu-
tandos ibo; Cato, Agr. 31, 1, ad oleam legendam; 114, 2, ad alvom
movendam; so 115, 1; 115, 2.

With *inter :* Cist. 721, inter rem agendam.

With *ob :* Com. Incert. 32, tetulit coronam ob colligandas nuptias;
Trag. Inc. 86, ob defendendam Graeciam; Cato, Agr. 134, 4, ob
struem obmovendam et fertum libandum.

6. **The ablative of the gerundive:**

a) With verbs: Epid. 433, pugnis memorandis meis eradicabam
hominum auris; Pseud. 1045, cor retunsumst oppugnando pectore;
Truc. 310, non meretriculis moenerandis rem coegit; And. 938,
animust commotus mirando tanto bono; H. T. 142, opere rustico
faciundo sumptum exsercirent suom; Enn. Trag. 134, nisi patrem
materno sanguine exanclando ulciscerem; Acc. 659, quaenam um-
quam poenis luendis dabitur satias supplici? Naev. Com. 18, caepe
edundo oculus profluit; 28, polluxi tibi iam publicando epulo Her-
culis; Tab. Triumph. (Baehr.) 1, 9, duello magno dirimendo, regibus
subigendis; Scipio (Meyer), p. 110, vostros honores rebus gerendis
praecessi; Cato, Agr. 139 (*bis*), hoc porco piaculo immolando; 132,
1, hac illace dape pollucenda; so 2; 134, 2, te hac strue ommovenda
bonas preces precor; so 3; 134, 2, te hoc ferto ommovendo bonas
preces precor; 141, 3, hisce suovetaurilibus lactentibus inmovendis;
so 4; Frag. (Jord.), 43, 7, omnem adulescentiam meam abstinui, agro
colendo, silicibus repastinandis atque conserendis; Lucil. 101, spatium
curando corpore (Dousa -*i*) honestum sumemus.

b) With adjectives: Asin. 873, opere faciendo lassus; Cas. 124,
te aggerunda curvom aqua faciam; Pers. 5, fio miser quaerendo
argento; Poen. 224, aggerundaque aqua sunt viri duo defessi;
Vid. 33, talis iactandis tuae sunt consuetae manus; Enn. Trag. 43,

fatis fandis dementem invitam ciet; Lucil. 167, lippus edenda cepa.

c) Ablative of the gerundive with prepositions:

With *de :* Hec. 391, de (ea) redducenda; so 403; Bacch. 223; Eun. 784, consilium de occludendis aedibus; CIL, i, 198, 76, de ceivitate danda; 198, 11, de patrono repudiando; 198, 19, de nomine deferundo iudicibusque legundeis; 198, 58, de leitibus aestumandeis.

With *ex :* Cato, Frag. (Jord.) 78, 7, ex medicamentis bibendis, ex alvo lavando.

With *in :* Amph. 1, in mercimoniis emundis vendundisque; 633, in aetate agunda; Stich. 55, in cogitando maerore augeor; And. 5, in prologis scribundis; H. T. 73, in opere faciundo; 74, in illis exercendis; Phor. 225, in re incipiunda; Ad. 967, in psaltria emunda; Enn. Ann. 257, aetate in agunda; Lucil. 495, aggere in iaciendo; 561, in re agenda; Metellus (Meyer), p. 203, in quibus quaerendis sapientes aetatem exigerent; CIL, i, 202, II, 15, in praeconibus legundis.

With *pro :* Pers. 426, pro liberanda amica; Pacuv. 104, pro merenda gratia redamptruare; Cato, Agr. 144, 5, pro ea olea legunda.

THE GERUND.

Genitive of the Gerund.[1]

The genitive of the gerund is used with nouns and adjectives, chiefly in objective relation.

a) With nouns.

1) Without modifiers.

astutia: Pacuv. 358, quibus abest intellegendi astutia.

causa: And. 158, vera obiurgandi causa; Phor. 50, puer causa erit mittendi; Hec. 342; Afran. 134, tutandi causa; Cato, Agr. 145, 2, oleum ne tangito utendi causa neque furandi causa; CIL, i, 199, 31, colendi causa; Enn. Ann. 234, causa pugnandi.

compendium: Pseud. 605, compendium te facere pultandi volo.

copia: Epid. 162, non enim nunc dormitandi neque cunctandi copia est; M. G. 1226, vix fuit copia adeundi atque impetrandi; H. T. 28, date crescendi copiam; Eun. 21, inspiciundi copia; 638 f.;

---

[1] For the literature on the gerund, see above, p. 441, under the gerundive.

Pacuv. 117, cognoscendi aut contuendi copia; Enn. Ann. 288, 7, nec respirandi fit copia.

exemplum: M. G. 637, ut exemplum experiundi habeas.

facilitas: And. 232, date facilitatem pariundi.

finis: And. 821, orandi iam finem face; Phor. 22; 23, peccandi finem.

gratia: Curc. 706, dicendi gratia haec natast mihi; Acc. 217, ne quisquam epulandi gratia accumbat.

locus: Capt. 213, detis locum loquendi; so M. G. 603; And. 154, obiurgandi locus; Acc. 418, nullus causandi locus; 432, dicendi est locus.

lubido: Trin. 745, ducendi apscesserit lubido.

modus: Asin. 167, qui modus dandi?

morbus: Cato, Frag. (Jord), 57, 29, numquam tacet quem morbus tenet loquendi, tamquam veternosum bibendi atque dormiendi.

occasio: Capt. 117, fugiendi occasio; Epid. 271, occasio faciundi; Amph. Frag. iii, abiendi occasio.

otium: Ad. 420, otium auscultandi.

pars: Asin. 517, meam partem loquendi.

pausa: Acc. 290, pausa loquendi; so Lucil. 17.

potestas: Epid. 15, vix adipiscendi potestas fuit; Pacuv. 24, cernundi do potestatem omnibus.

prolixitudo: Pacuv. 127, fandi prolixitudine.

pudor: And. 630, denegandi pudor.

satietas: Poen. 215, neque ulla ornandi satis satietas; Pacuv. 410, tuendi satietas.

spatium: Phor. 702, spatium vocandi, sacruficandi; Pacuv. 207, spatium ulciscendi.

tempus: Pers. 468, id erit adeundi tempus; Trin. 423, tempust adeundi; Poen. 741, tacendi tempus est; Hec. 44, agendi tempus mihi datum est.

via: H. T. 583, ulla accedendi via.

vicissitas: Acc. 586, vicissitatem inperitandi.

2) With adverbial modifier.

causa: Hec. 255, sin east causa retinendi apud vos.

copia: Pers. 538, ut tibi recte conciliandi facerem copiam; Rud. 765, in capite tuo si conflandi copiast.

labor: Pseud. 5, labori parsissem respondendi mihi.

locus: And. 232, in aliis potius peccandi locum.

potestas: Stich. 117, quoi male faciundi est potestas; And. 52, liberius vivendi potestas; Phor. 174.

principium: Stich. 671, domum redeundi principium placet.

spatium: And. 182, spatium cogitandi ad disturbandas nuptias.

spes: Afran. 350, spes reducendi domum.

tempus: Bacch. 772, nunc est mihi adeundi ad hominem tempus; Merc. 916, tempus non est intro eundi; Trin. 998, loquendi libere videtur tempus venisse.

via: Poen. 629, male loquendi vobis nescivi viam.

  3) With a direct object expressed or understood.

causa: Men. 687, neque te defrudandi caussa posco.

copia: H. T. 282, res dedit existumandi copiam vitae consuetudinem; Trin. 1131.

gratia: Curc. 706, non rem perdendi gratia.

labor: Pseud. 6, labori parsissem te rogandi.

locus: And. 354, quae non est narrandi locus.

occasio: Phor. 885, eludendi occasiost senes.

optio: Cas. 190, nec mihi ius meum optinendi optio est.

potestas: Stich. 281, potestas adipiscendist gloriam; Hec. 45, potestas condecorandi ludos scaenicos.

spatium: And. 806, spatium exquirendi meum factum; Capt. 743, spatiumst perferendi quae minitas; Phor. 701, spatium adparandi nuptias; Hec. 684, spatium amandi amicam.

  4) Accompanied by another genitive dependent on the same governing noun: Capt. 852, nominandi istorum tibi erit magis quam edendi copia; 1008, lucis das tuendi copiam; H. T. 29, novarum spectandi faciunt copiam; Enn. Trag. 207, neve navis incohandi exordium. According to Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 444, the two genitives in these examples are equally dependent upon the governing noun; the gerund simply defines more particularly the relation of the substantive.

  5) Peculiar are Capt. 153, edendi exercitus; Poen. 34, sermones fabulandi. In CIL, i, 542, tua pace rogans te cogendei dissolvendei tu ut facilia faxseis, *facilia* is very likely corrupt. It is generally explained as equivalent to *facilitatem*.

b) With adjectives: Hec. 91, cupida huc redeundi, abeundi a milite vosque videndi; 283, cupidus redeundi domum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 78, 13, colendi peritus; 80, 1, orator est, Marce fili, vir bonus, dicendi peritus.

c) Alone, denoting purpose, Ad. 270, ne id adsentandi magis quam quo habeam gratum facere existumes. This genitive is not to be explained as the result of ellipsis of *causa* or some similar word, but probably represents a primitive Italic usage seen also in Umbrian; Buck, Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, p. 197; cf. Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 445.

DATIVE OF THE GERUND.

Without object: Amph. 1006, auscultando operam dare; Asin. 169, quid modist ductando, amando? 882, quid modi amplexando facies? M. G. 1311, quid modi flendo facies? Poen. 231, neque lavando et fricando scimus facere neniam; Rud. 1205, osculando meliust pausam fieri.

With an object: Epid. 605, Epidicum operam quaerendo dabo; M. G. 260, hominem investigando operam dabo; Poen. 223, nos lavando, eluendo operam dederunt.

Stich. 681, curando, is corrupt. The dative of the gerund in Early Latin is confined to Plautus.

ACCUSATIVE OF THE GERUND.

This usage occurs only with prepositions.

a) With *ad*.

With nouns: Asin. 518, ad loquendum atque ad dicendum portisculum; Merc. 935, operam sumam ad pervestigandum; M. G. 80, si ad auscultandum vostra erit benignitas; And. 57, canes ad venandum; 138, nec satis ad obiurgandum causae; 150, vemens causa ad obiurgandum; H. T. 1044, principium capiam ad placandum; Phor. 423, aetas ad ducendum; 832, otium ad potandum; Ad. 25, ad scribundum industriam; Pacuv. 358, quibus abest ad praecavendum intellegendi astutia.

With adjectives: Bacch. 738, ad perdundum quam ad scribundum cita (codd.: *cito, scito*); Epid. 378, doctus ad male faciendum; M. G.

668, ad saltandum non cinaedus malacus aequest; Truc. 8, ad dene-
gandum ut celeri lingua utamini; 22, non omnis aetas ad perdiscendum
sat est; And. 705, dies hic ut satis sit ad agendum; 706, vocivom ad
narrandum; Phor. 533, qui prior ad dandumst; 818, tutus ad nar-
randum locus; Pacuv. 23, sese adfines esse ad causandum volunt.

With verbs: Pseud. 850, quo conductus venio. : : ad furandum
quidem; And. 1, animum ad scribendum adpulit; Phor. 240, ani-
mum ad cogitandum instituere; Pacuv. 17, attendi ad quaerendum;
378, ad manticulandum astu aggreditur; Trag. Inc. 81, ego tum gra-
vida expletis iam fere ad pariendum mensibus; 160, tam magis ad
male faciendum viget.

b) With *inter:* Enn. Frag. 540, inter ponendum; Afran. 422, inter
loquendum.

c) With *ob:* C. Gracchus (Meyer), p. 233, pretia ob tacendum
accipiunt.

It is doubtful whether Early Latin shows any instance of the
accusative of the gerund with a direct object. The text in Cist. 648
and Poen. 599 (sometimes cited as illustrating this use) is uncertain.

THE ABLATIVE OF THE GERUND.

ABLATIVE WITHOUT PREPOSITIONS.

1. The gerund has a direct object: Cas. 809, dirumpi cantando
hymenaeum; Men. 882, lumbi dolent manendo medicum; Trin.
1048, male fidem servando abrogant fidem; H. T. 114, eadem au-
diendo victus est; 711, vera dicendo ut eos fallam; Eun. 7, bene
vortendo et easdem scribendo male; 68, oculos terendo misere;
1008, defessa sum te ridendo; Hec. 254, ea refellendo aut purgando
vobis corrigemus; Pacuv. 315, defessus sum perrogitando advenas;
Lucil. 49, nomen causamque rogando exsculpo ut dicant.

2. The gerund is used alone without object or modifier: Amph. 414,
legiones vi pugnando cepimus; 588, neque fando umquam accepit
quisquam; Asin. 222, consuescunt osculando, oratione vinnula; 555,
pugnando fugae potiti; 687; 903; Bacch. 429, luctando saliendo sese
exercebant; 514, mendicum mendicando vincere; 981, ad lacrimas
hominem coegi castigando; Capt. 502, me restitando retinendo las-

sum reddiderunt; Curc. 52, nisi si est osculando inpudicior; 187,
hos perire amando video; 215, vapulando et somno pereo; Epid.
177, eam vivendo vincere; 200, rogitando sum raucus factus; 320,
exspectando exedor miser; 436, undantem chlamydem quassando
facit; 496, fando istunc hominem numquam audivi; Men. 882,
lumbi sedendo, oculi spectando dolent; 1054, te eripio pugnando;
Merc. 151, me rupi currendo; 312, ut med amando enices; M. G.
267, vi pugnandoque hominem caperest certa res; 1022, properando
excrucior; Most. 453, pultando paene perfregi hasce; 456; 1015,
potesse dissimulando infectum hoc reddere; Pers. 56, parasitando
paverint ventris; Poen. 778, nego; et negando arvio; Rud. 186,
experiundo is datur acerbum; 361, periit potando; 1017, non probarᴖ
pernegando potes; Stich. 70, exorando haud advorsando sumendam
operam censeo; 313, defessus sum pultando; Truc. 15, dat operam
ne sit relicuom poscendo atque auferendo; 327, lassus sum durando;
916, hic exspectando obdurui; Plaut. Frag. 81, superabo omnis argu-
tando praeficas; And. 17, faciuntne intellegendo; 544, orando impe-
trare; 912, sollicitando et pollicitando; H. T. 86, aut consolando
aut consilio; 330, orando surdas auris reddideras; 331, experiundo
scies; 457, pytissando quid vini absumpsit; 675, quaerendo investi-
gari; 879, deos gratulando obtundere; Eun. 554, rogitando obtundat;
846, miserrimus fugitando; Phor. 1034, accusando fieri infectum;
Hec. 123, tundendo atque odio effecit; 234, peccando detrimenti nil
fieri potest; 435, ut me ambulando rumperet; 815, cursando et am-
bulando hunc contrivi diem; Ad. 213, ego vapulando, ille verberando
defessi sumus; 713, defessus sum ambulando; 847, favillae plena
coquendo sit faxo et molendo; 880, si id fit dando atque obsequendo;
Pacuv. 168, quod bellando aptus sum; 318, nilne a Troia adportat
fando; 322, illum interea proliciendo propitiaturos remur; 374, id
usus experiundo edocet; Acc. 66, ut frustrando protrahas; 233, istam
imminuam curam infitiando; 475, astu et fallendo callet; 551, quod
resonando flebilis voces refert; Stat. 150, ita plorando orando in-
stando atque obiurgando me optudit; Afran. 210, defessa exspec-
tando; 275, tacendo periisse; Enn. Ann. 147, 3, certando animam
de corpore mitto; 191, cunctando restituit rem; 288, 4, nitendo
corpus discerpere ferro; Lucil. 673, nec ventorum flamina flando
suda secundet; 712, maledicendo inmundis sermonibus differs; 777,

nonnumquam dabit ipsa aetas quod prosit habendo; 786, cantando quemquam adseruisse ait ad se; 815, Sisyphus versat saxum sudans nitendo; C. Gracchus (Meyer), 233, si tu loquendo talentum quaesisti; Cato, Agr. 6, 2, ferundo arbor peribit; Frag. (Jord.), 83, 7, homines exercendo videmus conteri.

3. The gerund has an adverbial modifier: Amph. 1013, apud omnis aedis sacras sum defessus quaeritando; Asin. 222, bene salutando, consuescunt compellando blanditer; Bacch. 402, cave sis te superare servom siris faciundo bene; Capt. 832, prius quam pultando assulatim foribus exitium adfero; Curc. 508, male suadendo; Truc. 916, cubando in lecto; Phor. 697, nil est quin male narrando depravarier; Stat. 175, diu vivendo multa quae non volt videt; Paulus (Meyer), 201, annuendo enim votis meis id egerunt.

<center>ABLATIVE DEPENDENT ON PREPOSITIONS.</center>

1. With *a*: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 23, 1, trudere solent a recte consulendo atque intellegendo.

2. With *e*: Capt. 504, vix ex gratulando eminebam; Ad. 987, fieri ex adsentando, indulgendo et largiendo.

3. With *in*: Asin. 795, linguam in tussiendo proserat; Cas. 399, utinam in sortiendo sors deliquerit; Merc. 218, quid hic in lamentando pereo? Trin. 224, in cogitando dolorem indipiscor; 532, si in opserendo possint interfieri; And. 771, in pariundo aliquot adfuerunt; H. T. 323, in potiundo periclum; 665, ne nunc animo esses duro, ut olim in tollendo; Eun. 893, in cognoscendo tute ipse aderis; Hec. 25, in deterrendo operam sumere; 38, in experiundo ut essem; Ad. 24, in agendo partem ostendent; 858, in experiundo ut repudies; 869, contrivi in quaerundo vitam; 900, in adparando consumunt diem; Acc. 259, quanta in venando affecta est laetitudine! Enn. Ann. 293, non in sperando cupide rem prodere summam; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 22, 3, ne quid in consulendo advorsi eveniat.

4. With *pro*: Aul. 456, pro vapulando aps te mercedem petam.

THE SUPINE.

THE SUPINE IN -*UM*.[1]

The supine in -*um* is by origin the accusative of a verbal noun, used in the same terminal sense as the accusative of place names and some other words. Ordinarily we have the statement that the supine in -*um* is used after verbs of motion to express purpose. While a large proportion of all instances of the supine in -*um* are so used, yet the following material will show that it occurs with many other verbs than those strictly denoting motion. In many cases also the notion of purpose is not pronounced, e.g. *dare nuptum*. With *eo* and its compounds the supine forms a sort of periphrastic conjugation, e.g. And. 134, quor te is perditum ? The supine in -*um* of transitive verbs is freely construed with an object. The following examples are arranged according to the governing verbs with which the supine occurs.

abduco: Pseud. 520, servitum tibi me abducito.

abeo: Amph. 807, cubitum hinc abiimus; so Most. 486; Curc. 559, exsulatum abierit; so also Merc. 43; 593; Most. 596; Rud. 325; Trin. 535; M. G. 251, abiit ambulatum; Most. 989, comissatum abiisse; Pseud. 665, dormitum ut abeas; Rud. 707, vos in aram abite sessum; 898, abiit piscatum; H. T. 117, militatum abiit; 587, abi deambulatum; Eun. 600, abeunt lavatum; Hec. 224, rus habitatum abii. The three following examples have an object: Capt. 848, piscis praestinatum abire; M. G. 1145, concubinam abiit oratum suam; Rud. 1056, abiisti erum arcessitum.

accedo: Hec. 182, ad eam accesserat confabulatum.

accerso: Eun. 592, accersitur lavatum.

adeo: Bacch. 442, quom adeas postulatum.

advenio: Aul. 739, id te oratum advenio; Poen. 561, servom quaesitum advenies tuom; 765, captatum me advenis; Trin. 448, neque te derisum advenio; so Eun. 860; Truc. 270, advenisti huc te ostentatum; Phor. 360, me accusatum advenit; Phor. 388, temptatum advenis; Acc. 198, Thyestes Atreum adtractatum advenit.

advento: Aul. 145, ted id monitum advento.

[1] Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 464 ff.

aufugio : Pseud. 1035, ut exsulatum aufugiat.

aveho : Cist. 579, avecta est peregre hinc habitatum.

commigro : Trin. 1084, is habitatum huc commigravit.

conduco : Aul. 457, coctum, non vapulatum, conductus fui.

conloco : Trin. 735, nuptum conlocet.

curro : Merc. 857, quonam illum curram quaeritatum ? Stat. 11, ad amicos curret mutuatum.

devortor : Stich. 534, deos salutatum devortor domum ; so Phor. 311.

do (in the phrase *nuptum dare*) : Aul. 27, nuptum daret ; 271 ; 384 ; 604, nuptum dari ; Cas. 254 ; 770 ; Cist. 42 ; Pers. 383 ; Stich. 136 ; 140 ; 142 ; Trin. 713 ; And. 301, daturne nuptum ? Phor. 720 ; Hec. 528 ; Ad. 346.

duco : Cist. 90, pompam me spectatum duxit ; Poen. 20, sessum ducat.

eo :

a) The supine has an object, expressed or understood.

1) The expression is periphrastic : Aul. 247, it petitum gratiam ; 736, quam ob rem me meosque perditum ires liberos ; Cas. 721, si eas ereptum ; so Pers. 63 ; Cist. 4, mi honorem ire habitum ; Curc. 116, sitim sedatum it ; Poen. 512, ire operam datum ; Truc. 559, perditum se it ; Poen. 512, ire operam datum ; And. 134, quid agis ? quor is te perditum ? H. T. 315, laudem is quaesitum ? Stat. 148, eo privatum it me ; Cato, Frag. (Jord.) 51, 5, quod uti prohibitum irem. In the passive : Rud. 1242, istaec videtur praeda praedatum irier ; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 63, 6, in hac contumelia quae mihi factum itur. Expressions like these last paved the way for the future infinitive in *-um iri*.

2) The supine denotes purpose : Bacch. 347, amicos iit salutatum ; Cas. 162, fortunas eo questum ad vicinam ; Poen. 1134, oratum ierunt deam ; Rud. 766, ibo aliquo quaeritatum ignem ; Trin. 944, isse ad villam depromptum cibum ; Eun. 892, nutricem accersitum iit ; Phor. 838, ire ancillulam emptum ; Hec. 77, isse percontatum adventum.

b) The supine has no object.

1) The expression is periphrastic : Bacch. 755, accubitum eatis ; so also 1203 ; Men. 225 ; 368 ; Pseud. 891 ; Most. 317, ibo comissatum ; so 334 ; Stich. 775 ; Aul. 325, solet ire coctum ; so Pseud.

845; 853; Cas. 977, imus cubitum; so 853; Pseud. 846; Cato, Agr. 5, 5; 143, 2; Cist. 37, eunt depressum; Merc. 100, discubitum imus; Aul. 302, it dormitum; so also Curc. 183; Most. 693; 705; Merc. 644, exsulatum ire; so also 884; 981; Trin. 599, ibit latrocinatum; Aul. 579, eo lavatum; so also Rud. 382; Stich. 568; H. T. 655; Merc. 83, iturum mercatum; so also 358; Cas. 86, ibit nuptum; Trin. 315, irem obambulatum; Stich. 451, ibo opsonatum; Most. 878, ire vis pastum; so also Pers. 318; Phor. 462, percontatum ibo; Catulus, 1, 5, ibimus quaesitum; Poen. 320, sacruficatum ire; Pers. 447, supplicatum eat; so also Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 80, 11.

2) The supine denotes purpose: Bacch. 1171, ire oppugnatum; M. G. 621, ire opitulatum; Pacuv. 187, ut eant gratatum; Cato, Frag. 14, 3, qui aquatum ut lignatum videntur ire.

fero: Curc. 645, me spectatum tulerat.

incedo: Poen. 10, sessum incedere.

loco: Curc. Arg. 8, nuptum locat.

migro: Hec. 589, tu rus habitatum migres!

mitto: Curc. 67, parasitum misi petitum argentum; Pers. 322, me boves mercatum misit; so Merc. Arg. 1; Stich. 196, quem arcessitum missa sum; so And. 515; Amph. 20, pater me misit ad vos oratum; so Afran. 303; Aul. 605, speculatum misit me; Cas. 440, mittere opsonatum; Cas. 543, ut eam ad te adiutum mitterem; Eun. 442, Phaedriam intro mittamus comissatum; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 81, 10, praedatum misit.

pergo: M. G. 749, opsonatum pergam.

polliceor: Cas. 551, operam uxoris polliceor foras quasi catillatum.

prodeo: Rud. 295, huc prodimus pabulatum.

proficiscor: Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 35, 14, proficiscor servatum illos; Merc. 939, proficiscor quaesitum.

profugio: Ad. 385, profugiet militatum.

prosilio: Trin. 216, prosilui amicum castigatum.

provoco: Eun. 442, Pamphilam cantatum provocemus.

recipio: Curc. 228, quin reciperet se huc essum.

transeo: Stich. 437, transibo hanc occupatum noctem.

trado: Asin. 661, quin tradis huc cruminam pressatum umerum?

venio:

1) With an object: Amph. 587, venis derisum dominum; so

Aul. 223; Cas. 102, huc venisti sponsam praereptum; Men. 71, venit hunc quaeritatum geminum; 230, quam ob rem venimus? :: quaesitum germanum meum; so M. G. 442; Most. 594, venisti huc te extentatum; Pseud. 804, veniunt conductum coquom; 1283, venio foedus commemoratum; Stich. 107, exquisitum mores venis; 595, venias vasa lautum; Eun. 589, venisse fucum factum mulieri; 752, quam ereptum venit; Phor. 906, id venio nuntiatum; 973, venias lautum peccatum tuom; Liv. And. Od. 8, matrem procitum plurimi venerunt; Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 15, 8, eo dicunt maternam necem expiatum venisse; Amph. 50, quam rem oratum veni.

2) Without an object: Aul. 408, veni coquinatum; 429, venimus coctum; 752, supplicatum venio; Pers. 568, venient ad te comissatum; so Rud. 1422; Rud. 111, quon furatum mox venias? so Trin. 864; Trin. 611, venit oratum; Truc. 547, huc cubitum venero; so Lucil. 418; Lucil. 24, saltatum venisse.

voco: Men. 457, essum vocantur; so Stich. 182; Men. 835, me in silvam venatum vocas; Stich. 686, comissatum volo vocari.

THE SUPINE IN -*u*.[1]

The supine in -*u* is probably an original ablative in form and function. As such it appears both as an ablative of specification and in the separative use, also with *opus est*. Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 466, thinks the construction was by origin a dative. He cites in support of this view, Bacch. 62, istaec lepida sunt memoratui. This dative in -*ui*, he believes to have been supplanted very early by that in -*u* (a locative formation), and so to have come to be felt as an ablative by the Romans. But it seems much more natural to regard the forms in -*u* as entirely distinct from those in -*ui*. Passages like Bacch. 62, cited above, along with Cist. 365, me habes perditui et praedatui; Cas. 719, opsonatu redire, seem to point to an original free use of the verbal noun in -*us* in all cases. There is no reason for assuming that the ablative was not used freely at the outset, especially when we have an ablative form employed in several familiar ablative functions.

The following classification is based on the supines in actual use in Early Latin:

[1] Sjöstrand, De vi et usu supini secundi, 1891.

1. Used as ablative of specification: Cas. 880, ita ridicula auditu, iteratu sunt; M. G. 101, optumus cultu; Com. Incert. 47, haud facilest defensu; Pseud. 824, formidolosas dictu, non essu modo; Phor. 300, dictu facilius; Ad. 275, turpe dictu; M. G. 685, bona uxor suave ductust; Hec. 277, non facilest expurgatu; Aul. 582, hoc factust optumum; so Pseud. 185; Stich. 83; Cas. 625, tanta factu modo mira vidi; Most. 791, hau factu facile est; so Pers. 761; H. T. 704; Poen. 1109, quo illud gestu faciat facilius; Poen. 238, modus optumum est habitu; 288, quod satis est habitu; Stich. 59, habitu hau probust; Phor. 456, turpe inceptust; Trin. 679, facilest inventu; Cist. 229, miserum memoratu; Hec. 296, facile scitu. Many of the foregoing uses, it must be admitted, approach in function the value of the infinitive.

2. With *opus est*: H. T. 941, ita dictu opus est.

3. As ablative of separation: Cas. 719, redit tandem opsonatu; so also Men. 277; 288; Cato, Agr. 5, 5, primus cubitu surgat.

THE PERIPHRASTIC CONJUGATIONS.[1]

1. The periphrastic conjugation formed by combining the future active participle with the verb *sum*. In general there is little to note under this head. The usage in Early Latin agrees in all essential details with that of the later classical period. Thus the periphrastic conjugation may denote:

a) An intended act: Asin. 357, ille in balineas iturust; Bacch. 146, ituru's domum? 716, quid es facturus? Capt. 183, si venturu's, temperi; 359, si es missurus; Cas. 831, si daturae estis; Cist. 153, si tacuisset, ego eram dicturus; 378, quin is, si itura es? 507, non remissura es mihi illam?

b) An act on the point of happening: Amph. 263, attat, illic huc iturust; Capt. 789, quidnam acturust?

c) An act destined to occur: Bacch. 510, haec quae futura fabulor; Cist. 243, quae esset aetatem exactura mecum; Trin. 55, tua uxor quid agit? : : inmortalis est; vivet victuraque est.

d) A resolve: Bacch. 1003, nam ego non laturus sum.

e) Sometimes mere futurity: Amph. 296, certe advenientem hic

[1] Schmalz, Synt. und Stil.[4], p. 459 ff.

me hospitio pugneo accepturus est (cf. 298, hic pugnis faciet hodie
ut dormiam); 665, quia domi daturus nemost prandium advenienti-
bus; Bacch. 358, quid futurumst quom hoc resciverit? 1087, qui
fuerunt quique futuri sunt posthac; Cist. 47; Hec. 567, nam ut hic
laturus hoc siet.   See Tammelin, De participiis, p. 75.

For the future active participle in the future infinitive, see above,
p. 367 f.

**2. The periphrastic conjugation formed by combining the gerundive
with the verb *sum*.**   Here again there is substantial agreement be-
tween the usage of the early and classical periods.   Thus the
meaning may be that a thing must be done, deserves to be done,
ought to be done, is advisable, appropriate, etc., e.g. Bacch. 409,
minus mirandumst; Capt. 200, indigna digna habenda sunt erus
quae facit; 227, hoc agendum est; 986, quoius nihili sit faciunda
gratia; Cas. 444, captandust clanculum sermo mihi; Cist. 99, nunc
alia ducendast; Cas. 475, huc aures magis sunt adhibendae; 1004,
censeo veniam hanc dandam; Cist. 657, faciundum est puerile
officium; Curc. 111, censeo hanc appellandam anum; Cato, Agr.
2, 5, quae satis accipiunda sint, satis accipiantur; 38, ne foras sit
educendus.

A few intransitive verbs are used personally in this conjugation:
Epid. 74, puppis pereunda est probe; Trin. 264, Amor ignorandust
procul adhibendust atque abstandust; 1159, placenda dos est.

For instances of the impersonal use of the passive periphrastic
conjugation, see p. 8 f.   With a direct object: Trin. 869, agitan-
dumst vigilias.

3. The present participle combined with the verb *sum*.[1]   We find
several well-marked instances in Early Latin in which the present
participle with *sum* forms a genuine periphrastic combination.   In
other cases it is difficult to determine whether we have a periphrastic
combination or whether the participle is merely a predicate adjective.
In the genuinely periphrastic combinations no satisfactory theory of
difference between *ferens sum* and *fero* has been proposed.   The
material: Amph. 132, quoius cupiens maxumest; so M. G. 997, quae
huius cupiens corporist; Poen. 660, ille est cupiens; Cist. 28, sua-
rum opum nos volunt esse indigentes; Rud. 943, tui sermonis sum

---

[1] Tammelin, De participiis priscae Latinitatis, p. 70 ff.

indigens; Capt. 925, te carens dum hic fui; Curc. 292, quos semper videas bibentes esse in thermipolio; Most. 141, optigere illam neglegens fui; Phor. 271, ex qua re minus rei foret aut famae temperans; 394, primus esses progeniem vostram usque ab avo proferens. Less clearly periphrastic are the following: Poen. 1038, ut tu sis sciens; so also And. 508; 775; CIL, i, 196, 23, utei scientes essetis; Bacch. 439, magistro desinebat esse dicto oboediens. The same expression occurs also M. G. 806; 1129; Pers. 378, futura es dicto oboediens? Poen. 448. Amph. 989, ego sum Iovi dicto audiens; so 991; Pers. 399; 836; Trin. 1062; Truc. 125; Cato, Agr. 142; Bacch. 459, opsequens oboediensque est mori atque imperiis patris; so also Curc. 258; Merc. 150; 158; Most. 205; Pers. 181; H. T. 259; Hec. 459. Tammelin is inclined to recognize merely predicate adjectives in all the expressions of this second class (*sciens sis, oboediens est; dicto audiens est; opsequens est*).

For the periphrastic uses of the perfect passive participle with *do, reddo, habeo, teneo*, etc., see above, p. 438 f. For the periphrastic use of the supine with *eo*, see p. 454.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SENTENCE-QUESTION.[1]

THIS chapter is devoted to a consideration of the various types of the sentence-question so far as these have not already received treatment in the previous pages.[2] In the main I have followed the classification, and presented the results, of Morris in the paper cited below, merely adding such slight material from the other Early Latin writers (chiefly the dramatists) as was necessary for completeness.

A. Questions Introduced by -ne.

1. *-ne* appended to the verb (611).

a) Present Indicative.

   1) First Person.

    sumne (12), e.g. Merc. 588, sumne ego homo miser, qui nusquam bene queo quiescere? Men. 852, sumne mulier misera, quae illaec audio? Most. 362; Rud. 1184; Pers. 75; 474. *Sumne* is especially common in soliloquy, where it always has the force of *nonne sum ?*

       habeon: Stich. 566, habeon rem pactam? So also Trin. 500.

       novin: Epid. 550, novin ego te?

       possumne: Eun. 712, possumne ego hodie ex te exsculpere verum?

       repeton: Ad. 136, repeton quem dedi? where *-ne* has the force of *num.*

       teneone: H. T. 407.

---

[1] Morris, On the Sentence-Question in Plautus and Terence, reprinted from the Amer. Jour. Phil. x; xi ; Holtze, Syntaxis Priscorum Scriptorum Latinorum, ii, p. 236 ff.; Kühner, Ausführliche lat. Gramm. ii, p. 989 ff.; Dräger, Historische Syntax, i, p. 333 ff.

[2] For example, important types of the present and future indicative in sentence-questions have been considered at p. 21 ff.; p. 40; and types of the subjunctive in the sentence-question at p. 180 ff.

videon: Epid. 635, videon ego Telestidem? So also Stich. 582; Eun. 724; Hec. 81; Phor. 50; 177.

vincon: Amph. 433, vincon argumentis te non esse Sosiam?

Besides the instances of *sumne* in soliloquy, other examples of those above cited exhibit -*ne* with the force of *nonne*, e.g. Amph. 433; Eun. 712.

For the use of the present first singular with future force in sentence-questions, see p. 22 ff.

2) Second Person. Many of the questions cited under this head have a distinct imperative force, a class of uses to which attention has been called above, p. 25. A few examples occur in which -*ne* has the force of *nonne*.

ain (41):

With dependent infinitive (11), e.g. Epid. 717, ain tu te illius invenisse filiam? :: inveni; Most. 964; 974; Hec. 415; Ad. 517, ain patrem hinc abisse rus? As the emphasis is often upon the fact asserted, *ain* tends to become merely an introductory particle, like Eng. 'say!' This is indicated by the answer *inveni* in Epid. 717; similarly Truc. 193; Ad. 517.

Followed by a question with a verb of saying or thinking (4), e.g. Amph. 284, ain vero, verbero? deos esse tui similis putas? Capt. 892; Cas. 397. These usually imply a somewhat contemptuous rejection.

With repetition of a preceding phrase, either with or without the verb (13), e.g. Amph. 1088, geminos peperit filios :: ain tu? geminos? So Most. 383; 640; H. T. 1014; Epid. 699, lubuit . . . :: ain tu? lubuit? So Pers. 29a; 491; And. 875; Eun. 392. In most examples of this type *ain* is hardly more than an interjection. Morris compares the New England expression, " You don't say!"

ain tu (vero, tandem)? without any repeated phrase (13), e.g. Amph. 344, ain vero? :: aio enim vero; Aul. 298, ain tandem; Pers. 184; H. T. 890, ain tu? Com. Incert. 31, ain tandem, leno? Eun. 567; 803; Phor. 373. In this type also, *ain* is usually a mere interjection.

" *Ain* never refers forward (as *quid ais?* does) to what is about to be said, but always backward to what has been said."[1]

[1] Morris, p. 8.

audin (46): "This may refer backward to what has been said, always by some third speaker, or forward to what the speaker is about to say."[1]

Referring backward (22), e.g. Amph. 755, audin illum? Most. 821, audin 'fuerant' dicere? Poen. 999; Asin. 447, audin quae loquitur? M. G. 1222; And. 342, audin tu illum? Eun. 1037, audin quid ait? Most. 625, audin?

Referring forward (24), e.g. Asin. 116, audin tu? apud Archibulum ero; Men. 254; Poen. 408; 1006; Hec. 78, audin quid dicam? si quaeret me, dicas!

The frequency of this phrase tends to make it formulaic, approaching often the value of an interjection.

censen (11), e.g.: Aul. 309, censen talentum magnum exorari pote ab istoc sene? Merc. 461; And. 256, censen me verbum potuisse ullum proloqui? Eun. 217; Hec. 662.

cognoscin: Poen. 1130, cognoscin Giddenenem, ancillam tuam? Amph. 822.   In both these -*ne* is equivalent to *nonne.*

credin: Capt. 961, credin pudeat quom autumes? Poen. 441; Eun. 812, credin? 852.

deridesne: Curc. 392, quaeso, deridesne me?   18.

esne: Men. 1109, esne tu Suracusanus? Pers. 581.

faterin: Capt. 317, faterin eadem quae hic fassust mihi?

haben, habetin (7), e.g.: Bacch. 269, habetin aurum? Pseud. 1163, haben argentum? Truc. 680; Eun. 674, haben hominem?

iubesne: Eun. 389.

meministine: Epid. 554; Asin. 333; Pseud. 1089; H. T. 626; Phor. 224; Trag. Incert. 193; at times with the force of *nonne.*

negasne: Poen. 777, negasne apud te esse aurum?

novistine (17), Bacch. 837, novistine hominem?   So also Curc. 423; Epid. 503; Men. 748; H. T. 180; Eun. 328; 349; Phor. 63; Ad. 177; 573; at times with the force of *nonne.*

perdormiscin: Men. 928, perdormiscin tu usque ad lucem?

pergin (23), e.g. Amph. 349, pergin argutarier; Asin. 477; Eun. 817, pergin, scelesta, mecum perplexe loqui? H. T. 237; Ad. 853.

potesne: Poen. 309, potesne mi auscultare?

[1] Morris, p. 8.

rerin: Bacch. 1127, rerin ter in anno tu posse has tonsitari ? scin, scitin (55).

　　With direct object: Epid. 207, scin tu istuc ? Ad. 581.

　　With infinitive (6), e.g. Amph. 1082, scin me tuom esse erum Amphitruonem? Poen. 879; Eun. 744, scin tu turbam hanc propter te esse factam ?

　　With indirect question in the subjunctive (4), e.g. Men. 530, scin quod hoc sit spinter ? Trin. 373; Eun. 437, scin te ut male urat ?

　　scin quid with the indicative (15), e.g. Men. 677, scin quid est, quod ego ad te venio ? 1154; Eun. 338, scin quid ego te volebam ? H. T. 494; Hec. 753.

　　scin quid with dependent deliberative (5), e.g. Pers. 154, sed scin quid facias ? M. G. 1034.　In this and the preceding type, *scin* sinks to the level of an empty formula.

　　scin quam, quo pacto, quo modo, ut, with indicative or sub-junctive (10), e.g. Pers. 139, scin quam potest ? Poen. 1319; Amph. 671, scin quam bono animo sim ? Bacch. 594.　These expressions are used to pave the way for explanations uttered in "an exagger-ated tone of correction" (Morris, p. 15).

　　scin quo modo (quam, quem ad modum, quoius modi, quid), without verb (12), e.g. Amph. 356, at scin quo modo; Aul. 307; H. T. 738, at scin quid? Phor. 111; Eun. 1063.　These expressions are likewise corrective of what has preceded.

　　scin tu ? alone: only Rud. 382, scin tu ? etiam qui it lavatum. . . .

　　sentin: Com. Incert. 45, sentin senem esse tactum xxx minis ?

　　sponden (7), e.g. Aul. 256, sponden ergo ? Capt. 898; Trin. 1157; Com. Incert. 15.

　　stasne : Cas. 750.

　　tenesne: H. T. 778.

　　valen : Trin. 50.

　　viden, videtin (50).

　　With direct object (13), e.g. Bacch. 834, viden convivium ? 1161; Most. 829; Epid. 221 ; Rud. 253 ; Turp. 102 ; Com. Incert. 13, videsne haec ?

With infinitive (10), e.g. Capt. 595, viden tu illi maculari corpus totum maculis? Poen. 979; And. 616; Eun. 241. In these -*ne* has the force of *nonne.*

With dependent clause introduced by *ut, quam, quid* (26), e.g. Curc. 160, viden ut anus tremula medicinam facit? Acc. 303, viden ut te inpietas stimulat nec moderat metus? Turp. 103, viden ut fastidit mei? 104; Afran. 91; Asin. 636; Bacch. 492; 1130; Eun. 265; 783.

viden? alone (5), e.g. Capt. 304, sed viden? H. T. 252.
vin, voltis (60):

With accusative (6), e.g. Curc. 313, vin aquam? Rud. 1328.

With the infinitive (28), e.g. Men. 141, vin tu facinus luculentum inspicere? Merc. 769; Poen. 159; 161; H. T. 585; Phor. 807; Ad. 906; Amph. 769, vin proferri pateram? Asin. 646; Men. 653; Phor. 811; Ad. 969; Merc. 462, vin me tecum illo ire? 485; H. T. 624; Hec. 725; Phor. 810.

With the present subjunctive (26), e.g. Capt. 360, vin vocem huc ad te? Merc. 486; 722; M. G. 335; Most. 322; Trin. 59; Phor. 102, voltisne eamus? Eun. 894; Hec. 787.

vivisne: Rud. 243, vivisne, opsecro?

3) Third Person. These present few features calling for extended comment. The material is as follows: amatne, Epid. 64; cognoscitne, Eun. 915; daturne, And. 301; doletne, Pseud. 155; egetne, Trin. 330; estne, Truc. 188; so also Poen. 797; Rud. 1130; H. T. 454; Eun. 361; Ad. 569; often in soliloquy, as Bacch. 534, estne hic meus sodalis? So Curc. 230; Poen. 1299; And. 801; Eun. 848; fertne, Bacch. 322; foetetne, Asin. 928; licetne, Cas. 457; Curc. 401; Hec. 873; And. 893; M. G. 501; paenitetne, Truc. 533; scitne, Pseud. 745; soletne, Stat. 164; solentne, Turp. 130; valetne, Truc. 189; vivitne, Capt. 282; 989; H. T. 660; vivontne, Phor. 749.

Questions in the 3d sing. in which -*ne* is equivalent to *nonne:* Amph. 526, facitne ut dixi? And. 17, faciuntne intellegendo ut nil intellegant? Most. 625; Epid. 622, estne ita ut dixi? Amph. 780; Pers. 225; Phor. 896.

b) Imperfect Indicative: only Pseud. 1181, conveniebatne? Hec. 157, ibatne? Eun. 698, norasne eum prius?

c) Future Indicative.

1) First Person: M. G. 1242, adibon? Stich. 428, ad cenam ibone? And. 612, negabon?

2) Second Person: Bacch. 883, dabin? So also Pseud. 117; 536; 1077; Pseud. 1224, auferen? Epid. 148, patierin? So Cist. 500; Phor. 518, poterin? Stich. 612, ibisne?

3) Third Person: Most. 580, reddeturne igitur faenus?

d) Perfect Indicative.

1) First Person (24), e.g. Amph. 823, cenavin? Epid. 703, dedin? so Truc. 935; Bacch. 856, dixin? Cist. 295; Eun. 691, emin? Cas. 170, iussin? So also Asin. 424; 425; 426; Bacch. 561, misine? Pseud. 977, scivin? Ad. 178, tetigin? H. T. 563, vidin? Capt. 703, votuin?

"In nearly all these cases there is a perfectly clear *nonne* effect" (Morris, p. 23), but Cist. 295 is a question for information, while Ad. 178, tetigin is equivalent to *num tetigi ?*

2) Second Person (54), e.g. accepistin, Truc. 791; adduxtin, Capt. 1016; Phor. 568; adnuistin, Stich. 224; audivistin, Amph. 748; And. 785; aufugistin, Eun. 851; cenavistin, Curc. 18; convenistin, Pseud. 1079; dedistin, Trin. 129; dixtin, Most. 552; Eun. 793; Hec. 451; emistin, Trin. 124; fuistin, Capt. 628; inconciliastin, Trin. 136; intellextin, And. 201; Eun. 768; iuravistin, Pseud. 352; perdidistin, Curc. 584; promistin, Curc. 709. So also Rud. 1384; sensistin, Hec. 316; surrupuistin, Men. 507; tetigistin, Most. 457; 461; valuistin, Amph. 679; Trin. 50; vidistin, Amph. 616; M. G. 546; Eun. 350; Ad. 400; Titin. 120. In Eun. 793, dixtin, and Pseud. 352, iuravistin, the *-ne* question has the force of *nonne*. Compound forms: Bacch. 803, loquitatusne es? M. G. 558, ratun es?

3) Third Person (11): accepitne, Bacch. 250; caruitne, Curc. 17; convenitne, M. G. 1105; fuitne, Capt. 633; Trin. 106; habuitne, Trin. 330; peperitne, Truc. 504; rettulitne, Asin. 444; venitne, Bacch. 247; Truc. 931; Pseud. 1067.

"Some of these, Trin. 106; Capt. 633; Truc. 931, have some *nonne* effect though it is not absolutely necessary to take any of them so" (Morris, p. 25). Compound forms: Merc. 202, visun est? M. G. 462, visan est?

e) Present Subjunctive: And. 639, adeamne? Phor. 186, loquarne? Hec. 442, maneamne? Trin. 952, noverisne? Merc. 518, possin?

f) Imperfect Subjunctive: Capt. 714, essetne? so also Trin. 178.

g) Perfect Subjunctive: Merc. 301, aussimne?

h) Infinitive: Men. 795, servirin tibi postulas viros?

i) Periphrastic Conjugations: Poen. 432, abiturun es? Most. 62, ervom daturin estis? Atta, 1, daturin estis aurum? Eun. 462, ituran quopiam es? Cas. 610, missurusne es ad me uxorem tuam? Hec. 661, mirandumne id est?

2. -*ne* appended to pronouns (384).

a) *egone* (89).

1) With the indicative (8), e.g. Amph. 747, egon istuc dixi? 743; Bacch. 806; Men. 389; Phor. 999.

2) With the subjunctive in repudiating questions and exclamations (81); see p. 188 ff. At times we find *egone* alone without a verb, e.g. Asin. 900, ecquid matrem amas? :: egone illam; 609; Cas. 243; Merc. 317; 323; M. G. 1139; Truc. 898; And. 504; Eun. 65; 757.

b) *tune* (88).

1) With the indicative (69), e.g. Merc. 305, tun capite cano amas? Curc. 419, tun is es? Capt. 572; Men. 305; Pseud. 978; And. 910, tune in fraudem inlicis? Hec. 549; Most. 331, tune ais? Capt. 571; Amph. 373, tun audes dicere? Bacch. 1163; 822, tun autumas? Ad. 924, tun iubes? Acc. 417, tun dia Mede's? 491, tun socium mittis leto? Imperfect: Hec. 340, tun hic eras? Eun. 86; Phor. 945. Future: Asin. 106, tun redimes me? Stat. 14, tun iam callebis? Rud. 748. Perfect: Amph. 717, tun heri hunc salutavisti? Most. 369, tutin vidisti? Trin. 1179; Ad. 638, tune has pepulisti fores? Pluperfect: Phor. 613, tun dixeras huic?

2) With the subjunctive (11). These are mostly repudiating questions and exclamations. Present: Asin. 628; 700; Aul. 756; Cas. 111; M. G. 497; Pers. 135; 295; And. 910; Eun. 808; see p. 188. Imperfect: Phor. 932 (conditional). Perfect: Amph. 818, tun mecum fueris! p. 189.

3) Without verb (8), e.g. Asin. 230; Merc. 158; H. T. 343; Hec. 862; Ad. 127.

Even in the indicative the idea of rejection or repudiation is usually marked in questions introduced by *tune*.

c) *-ne* with other forms of the personal pronouns (54).

1) *men* (24), e.g. Men. 606, men rogas ? So also Epid. 98; H. T. 246. Other verbs: Men. 786; Poen. 399; Ad. 543; And. 908; Phor. 448. Without verb: Stich. 254; Trin. 69; And. 450; Hec. 692; 748.

2) *mene* (abl.): Poen. 368, mene ego illaec patiar praesente dici?

3) *mein:* Stich. 334, mein fastidis (*mihi in,* codd.); so also Titin. 93 (mei, *codd.*).

4) *mihin* (12), e.g. Curc. 571, mihin malum minitare ? Men. 868. Without verb, Curc. 422; Stich. 635; And. 476; 849; 850; Hec. 523.

5) *ten* (9), e.g. Rud. 235, ten, Palaestra, audio ? Asin. 94, ten ego defrudem? Asin. 700; 669; 697. These are chiefly repudiating questions. Without verb: Merc. 504; Eun. 218.

6) *tibine:* H. T. 102, tibine haec diutius licere speras facere ? Without verb: Pers. 721; Eun. 577.

7) *nosne:* Poen. 1238; And. 804.

8) *vosne:* Stich. 132, vosne ego patiar cum mendicis nuptas! 135, vosne latrones magni penditis?

d) Possessive pronouns with *-ne* (21).

1) *meus* (9), e.g. Bacch. 842, meamne hic Mnesilochus ut retineat mulierem! Capt. 853; Rud. 839. Without verb: Curc. 357, meosne amores! Phor. 198.

2) *noster:* Trin. 512, nostramne vis nutricem abalienare ? Ad. 330.

3) *tuos* (9), e.g. Capt. 845, tuan causa aedis incensurum censes ? Pers. 338; 747; Eun. 428, tuomne hoc dictum erat ? Without verb: Epid. 688; Ad. 400.

4) *suos:* And. 932, suamne esse aibat ?

Many of these questions with possessive pronouns have a strong tone of repudiation.

e) Demonstrative pronouns with *-ne* (132).

1) *hicine* (48), e.g. Amph. 514, hoccin placet? Most. 10, em, hocine volebas? 25; 26; 27; Trin. 186; H. T. 1029, hocine quaesisti? Phor. 1012; Hec. 283; Ad. 237; Merc. 356, hocinest amare ? And. 236; Amph. 362, haecine tua domust ? And. 907; Hec. 771; Epid. 621, haecinest ? 574; Pacuv. 119, hicine is est, quem fama

nobilitat ? Acc. 96, hocinest, quod tu meam benevolentiam interisse
es ratus ? Trag. Incert. 93; Lucil. 206. "Except with *est*, hicine
regularly introduces a rejecting exclamation" (Morris, p. 32).

   2) *isticine:* in similar uses (7), e.g. Asin. 932, istoscin patrem
aequom est mores liberis largirier ? Merc. 620; Pseud. 847; Eun.
830, istucine interminata sum ?

   3) *illicine:* Pseud. 954, illicinest ? Truc. 599; H. T. 199.

   4) *isne* (17), e.g. Capt. 987, isne istic fuit? Curc. 82; M. G.
532; And. 629, idne est verum ? H. T. 616; Ad. 939; Cato, Frag.
(Jord.), 25, 5, idne irascimini ? Lucil. 347, idne aegri est ?   With
subjunctive: And. 263, ein ego ut advorser ! Trin. 961.

   5) Other pronominal forms (59), e.g. Merc. 203, illamne, obse-
cro ? Eun. 356, illumne, obsecro, inhonestum hominem ? Pseud.
205, illine audeant! Trin. 987, is ipsusne es ? 988; 902, ab ipson
istas accepisti ? Capt. 154, nullumne interea nactu's ? H. T. 1006,
nullamne ego rem umquam volui ? Bacch. 479; And. 247; Stich.
260; Truc. 285; Hec. 323, nemon medicum adduxit? Phor. 152;
Asin. 933, nilne te pudet ? Pers. 424; Pseud. 78; Pacuv. 34,
nilne ad te de iudicio armum accidit ? 318; Trag. Incert. 245; Stat.
16, nihilne, nil tibi esse quod edim ? Atta, 7; Ad. 528. Without
verb: And. 435, nilne?   Bacch. 421, eademne erat disciplina tibi ?
H. T. 75, tantumne est oti tibi ?   Hec. 813; Trin. 609; Stat. 217.

   "With certain limitations, all pronominal questions refer back-
ward, taking up some previous idea, which may have been distinctly
expressed or merely implied, and repeating it in an exclamatory way,
so as to suggest that it is untenable. . . . The limitations are these:
sentences with *est* are regularly for information, when they are asked
about some definite person or thing.   Pronouns used alone do not
ask for information and are exclamatory, but do not necessarily
express rejection.   Especially after questions they indicate only
doubt or mild surprise.   Pronouns which approach adjectives most
nearly, e.g. *nullus, tantus, idem*, seem to have the least rejecting force,
and sometimes lack it entirely" (Morris, p. 33).

   3. *-ne* appended to nouns (35).

   a) With verb (23), e.g. Pers. 26, disne advorser !   Turp. 71, vinon
(non, *codd*) invitat plusculum sese, ut solet ? Pers. 584, opusne est ?
M. G. 663, opusne erit ? 664.

b) Without verb (12), e.g. Epid. 30, armane?

4. *-ne* appended to adjectives and participles (60). " Questions of this form are for the most part regular. The adjective is generally in the nominative. Of other cases, Plautus has only *bonan fide* (3), *bellan specie, pro lignean salute* (Pseud. 47), *tribusne, alienon, omnene* (acc.), *omnian* (2). Terence has *pro certon, multon, rufamne, duasne, binan, bonan.* In the nominative Plautus has: *alienus, certum* (7), *dives, dignus, exspectatus, insanus, malus, molestus, sanus* (16), *relictus, tenax, verus.* Terence has: *certum, dubium, sanus* (2) *salva"* (Morris, p. 34). I have noted also the following examples: Stat. 158, sed tua morosane uxor est? 188, liberne es? Turp. 117, sanusne es, qui temere lamentere?

5. *-ne* appended to adverbs (278).

a) Local adverbs (10), e.g. Aul. 335, huccine detrusti me ad senem parcissimum? M. G. 181, Philocomasium hicine etiam nunc est? Trin. 1079; Ad. 183, hicine libertatem aiunt esse aequam omnibus? Rud. 110, isticine vos habitatis?

b) *adeon* (6), e.g. And. 277, adeon me ignavom putas? 278; Phor. 1040; Hec. 547. These are repudiating.

c) *sicine* (15), Asin. 127, sicine hoc fit? Merc. 158; Rud. 251; H. T. 166, sicine est sententia? Eun. 99. These are all repudiating.

d) *iamne* (40).

1) 1st sing. e.g. Curc. 132, iamne dico? Curc. 214; Eun. 492, iamne imus? Stat. 34, iamne adeo?

2) 2d person (sing. and plu.), e.g. Rud. 584, iamne abis? so Most. 991; Poen. 678, iamne itis? Aul. 819, iamne autem, ut soles? So Bacch. 203 and elsewhere; Amph. 485, iamne hoc scitis? Poen. 116, iamne hoc tenetis? Ad. 186, iamne me vis dicere? Truc. 634, iamne abiisti? H. T. 848, iamne oblitus es? Liv. And. Trag. 7, iamne oculos specie laetavisti optabili? Pseud. 1126, iamne illum comessurus es?

3) 3d person (sing. and plu.), e.g. Curc. 50, iamne ea fert iugum? Eun. 550, iamne erumpere hoc licet mi gaudium? Men. 333, iamne, abiit? 550; 876, iamne isti abierunt?

e) *etiamne* (27).

1) Without time-force, e.g. Amph. 760, etiamne hoc negabis? Asin. 40; Most. 272; H. T. 742, etiamne tecum hic res mihist?

Eun. 143; Phor. 238; Naev. Com. 87, etiamne (etiam se, *codd*) audent mecum una apparere ?

  2) Meaning 'still,' 'yet,' e.g. Most. 522, etiamne astas ? Men. 710; Rud. 846; Phor. 774, etiamne id dubiumst ?

  3) In sentences equivalent to an imperative, e.g. Most. 937, etiamne aperis ? 938; Poen. 431, etiamne abis ? Rud. 467, etiamne hanc urnam acceptura's ?   Similarly Cas. 977, etiamne imus? (= *eamus*).

  f) *itane* (50).

  1) *itane* alone referring backward to what has been said, e.g. M. G. 1278; Pers. 291; H. T. 887; Eun. 1058. *itane vero:* Curc. 725. With a question following, Merc. 919; Rud. 747; Phor. 392.

  2) With a verb, referring backward, and so having a definite standard of comparison, e.g. Men. 948, itane censes ? Poen. 660, itane ille est cupiens ? And. 399, itane credis ? Eun. 76; Stat. 30; 31.

  3) *itane* followed by a clause of result, e.g. Bacch. 477, itane oportet rem mandatam gerere, ut mulierem teneat sedens ? And. 916, itane adtemperate evenit ut hodie veniret ? Eun. 240.

  4) With the standard of comparison so indefinite that *itane* seems to have become weakened into a mere interrogative particle (only in Terence): And. 926, itane vero obturbat? Phor. 315; 536; 231.

  g) *satin* (93).

  1) *satis* retains its original sense and the questions are frequently answered by *satis*.

        With *est*, e.g. Men. 616, satin hoc est tibi ? Phor. 210, satin est ? Phor. 683, satin est id ?

        With *habes* or *est* and conditional clause, e.g. Amph. 509, satin habes, si feminarum nullast quam aeque diligam ?   Most. 389; Phor. 856, satine est, si te delibutum gaudio reddo ?

        With adjectives, e.g. Amph. 604, satin tu sanus es ? so Men. 510; Ad. 937; Ad. 329, satin hoc certumst ? Pers. 183; Cas. 897.

        With adverbs, e.g. Amph. 578, satin hoc plane, satin diserte esse nunc videor tibi locutus ? And. 804, satin recte ? Trin. 1177; Pers. 18, satin ergo ex sententia ?

With perfect participles, e.g. Bacch. 1202, satin ego istuc habeo offirmatum ? M. G. 574.

With verbs, e.g. Men. 602, satin audis quae illic loquitur ? Most. 831, satin habes (= *intellegis*); Poen. 171; Ad. 402, satin scis ibi esse ? Acc. Trag. 475, satin astu et fallendo callet ? Enn. Ann. 257.

" In the examples above given there is a gradual weakening of meaning. . . . From 'enough for this definite purpose or occasion,' *satis* comes to mean 'enough for practical purposes,' 'enough for ordinary occasions,' 'well enough.' We have the same tendency illustrated in English 'enough,' and perhaps more clearly in 'quite' as used in America. With this loss of definite standard, there goes also a loss of definite construction in the sentence ; *satis* affects the whole sentence rather than any single word in it." (Morris, p. 38).

2) *satis* does *not* retain its original sense and an answer with *satis* is not possible, as it is in the examples cited under 1), e.g. Most. 76, satin abiit, neque quod dixi flocci existumat? Capt. 653; Epid. 666; Men. 522; Merc. 337; M. G. 393; 999; Poen. 919; Rud. 462; Truc. 553. " In these questions the weakening of *satis* has gone still further, until the original idea of standard of comparison is wholly lost and *satis* has come to mean 'really,' 'actually '" (Morris, p. 39). In the following instances an exclamatory *ut* accompanies *satis:* M. G. 1134, satin ut commoditas usquequaque me adiuvat ! Men. 181, satin ut occaecatust prae huius corporis candoribus ! Merc. 481; Pers. 658; Stich. 271; Bacch. 491, satin ut quem tu habeas fidelem nescias ! Acc. 98; Turp. 87, satine ut se meum cor voluptatibus dat ?

h) Other adverbs (37), e.g. *advorsum, bene* (3), *certo* (3), *certe* (3), *facile, hodie, ilico, itidem, male, modo* (2), *numquam* (3), *nuncin, perpetue, plane, potius, prius, recte, serio, tam* (*tamine*), *vero* (3), *usque* (2), *salve.*

6. *potin* (35).

a) For *potin* with subjunctive alone, the subjunctive with *ut*, with *ne*, and with *ut ne*, see p. 237.

b) *potin* with the infinitive: Curc. 246, potin coniecturam facere ? Cist. 231; Poen. 1089; Trin. 759; And. 437, potin es mihi verum dicere ? Eun. 101, potin est hic tacere ?

7. nonne (30; in Plautus always before a vowel):[1] Amph. 404, nonne hac noctu nostra navis huc ex portu Persico venit? nonne huc me erus misit meus? nonne ego nunc sto ante aedis nostras? . . . nonne hic modo me pugnis contudit? 452, nonne erae meae nuntiare, quod erus meus iussit licet? 539, nonne ego possum, furcifer, te perdere? 625, quaeso, nonne intellegis? Curc. 552, nonne eis crederem? Merc. 880, caelum ut est splendore plenum nonne ex advorso vides? Trin. 1046, nonne hoc animum advorti; Pers. 747, nonne antestaris? Pseud. 1322, nonne audes aliquam partem mihi gratiam facere hinc de argento? Trin. 789, nonne arbitraris adulescentem anuli paterni signum novisse? Amph. 165, nonne idem hoc luci me mittere potuit? And. 238, nonne oportuit praescisse me ante? 239; 647; 869; H. T. 545, nonne aliquam fabricam fingit? 922; Eun. 165, nonne quaesivi? 334; 736; Phor. 768; Hec. 552; Ad. 660, nonne haec iusta tibi videtur poscere? Pacuv. 16, nonne hinc vos propere amolimini? 129, nonne officium fungar vulgi atque aegre male factum feram? Acc. 288, nonne Argivos fremere bellum et velle vim volgus vides? Fannius (Meyer), p. 221, nonne illos omnia occupaturos putatis? Truc. 267, nonne ego videor?

As may be seen from the above material, *nonne*-questions are infrequent in Early Latin, *non* being the regular particle instead of *nonne*. Some have even denied the use of *nonne* in Plautus and Terence; see Morris, p. 41.

8. -ne appended to relatives (20). Sentences of this kind fall into classes, according as the antecedent is or is not expressed.

a) The antecedent is not expressed, e.g. Most. 738, ventus navem nostram deseruit. :: quid est? quo modo? :: pessumo. :: quaene subducta erat tuto in terra? Curc. 705, ne quisquam a me argentum auferat. :: quodne promisti? Amph. 697; Epid. 719; M. G. 13; Rud. 861; 1019; 1231; Truc. 506; And. 768, quemne ego heri vidi ad vos adferri? Phor. 923. The following have the subjunctive: Rud. 767, ignem magnum faciam. :: quin inhumanum exuras tibi? Trin. 360.

b) The relative clause precedes the leading clause, and the antecedent is either expressed or plainly implied: Stich. 501, quaene

---

[1] See Schrader, De particularum -ne, anne, nonne, 1885 (Diss. Phil. Argentorat. viii, p. 296 ff.), p. 42 ff.

eapse deciens in die mutat locum, eam auspicavi ego in re capitali mea ? Rud. 272, quaene eiectae e mari sumus ambae, opsecro, unde nos hostias agere voluisti huc ? M. G. 614, quodne vobis placeat, displiceat mihi ?   Morris includes also Cist. 675.

9. -ne appended to conjunctions: Merc. 573, pervorse facis ? : : quodne amem ? Most. 1132, ego ibo pro te. : : verbero, etiam inrides ? : : quiane me pro te ire ad cenam autumo ?   Pers. 851; M. G. 1005, iam adlubescit primulum : : priusne quam illam oculis vidisti ? Truc. 694.

10. Appended to interrogative words: Trin. 1095, qualine amico mea commendavi bona ?

Attention has been frequently called above to *ne*-questions used with the force of *nonne*-questions. By those who connect the interrogative *-ne* with the negative *ne*, such sentences are regarded as exhibiting the survival of the original force of *-ne*. But it seems safer to dissociate *-ne* from negative *ne; -ne* is more likely to have been connected with asseverative *ne* (Glöckner, in Wölfflin's Archiv, xi, p. 491 ff.; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 618). *-ne*-questions, therefore, seem to have been originally neutral in character. It was the context and intonation that suggested in each case the character of the answer expected.

B. Questions Introduced by *num, numnam, numne, numquis*.

With Walde (Wörterbuch), Brugmann (Kurze Vgl. Gramm. § 838), and others I regard *num* as most probably the basis of *nunc* and so meaning originally 'now.'

1. *num* (77).

a) Sentences in which " the context shows that the speaker could not possibly have held the negative opinion or have expected a negative answer" (Morris, p. 47): Aul. 242, sed pro Iuppiter, num ego disperii; Men. 413, num istaec mulier illinc (from Syracuse) venit, quae te novit tam cate : : hercle opinor; pernegari non potest; Amph. 620, num obdormivisti dudum ? 709; 753; Turp. 104, viden ut osculatur cariem ? num hilum illa haec pudet ?

Morris recognizes 15 examples under this head for Plautus and Terence; but the bulk of these are introduced by *numnam* (for which

see below), while of the others several do not seem to me to belong
here.

b) " In some cases the question is clearly asked for information "
(38), e.g. Men. 620, num ancillae aut servi tibi responsant ? elo-
quere! inpune non erit; 890, num larvatust aut cerritus ? fac sciam.
num eum veternus aut aqua intercus tenet ? Merc. 173, obsecro, num
navis periit ? : : salvast navis; Asin. 29, dic serio quod te rogem
. . . num me illuc ducis ubi lapis lapidem terit ?   The foregoing
are distinctly neutral; in many others (see Morris, p. 48) " the
context does not forbid the negative sense nor does it require it.
If it is presumed on the evidence of the later usage that *num*
requires a negative answer, these questions would not be inconsis-
tent with the rule; if it can be shown that *num* is properly neutral
in sense, there is nothing to prevent these cases being so understood."
Examples are: Asin. 619; Aul. 161; Bacch. 212; Capt. 658; Merc.
132; Most. 336; And. 438; Eun. 756; Phor. 846; Ad. 488; Lucil.
823, num dolet ? Pacuv. 241.

c) " Sentences which challenge the hearer to acknowledge some-
thing which the dialogue or the action makes evident. . . .   It is
not quite accurate to say that *num* here expects a negative answer.
It challenges the hearer to deny if he can, but the denial is not
waited for." (Morris, p. 48) (33), e.g. Capt. 632, meam rem non cures,
si recte facias. num ego curo tuam ? Men. 627, potin ut molestus ne
sis ? num te appello ? Curc. 365, num moror; so Most. 794; Epid.
681; H. T. 793, num mihi datumst ? num iussi ? num illa oppig-
nerare filiam meam me invito potuit ? Phor. 411; 524; And. 477;
496 ; 578; Most. 345, num mirum aut novom quippiam facit ?

2. *numnam.*   In questions with *numnam* the context shows that
regularly (probably always) the speaker did not hold a negative
opinion or expect a negative answer : Amph. 1073, numnam hunc
percussit Iuppiter ? credo edepol; Aul. 389, strepitust intus.   num-
nam ego compilor miser ? Eun. 947, quae illaec turbast ? numnam
ego perii ? Amph. 321; Cist. 658; Poen. 976; Eun. 286; H. T. 517.
Separated: M. G. 924, num ille te nam novit ? Truc. 352; 602.

3. *numne.*   All of the instances of *numne* cited for Early Latin
(Poen. 1079; Afran. 29; Naev. Com. 44) rest upon improbable con-
jecture.

4. numquis, numquid (107).

a) Questions asking for information (15), e.g. Most. 999, numquid processit ad forum hic hodie novi? 1031; Merc. 369, numquid tibi dolet? Eun. 272, numquidnam hic quod nolis vides? Bacch. 538; And. 943; Capt. 172, num quo foras vocatus es? Curc. 23; 25; Merc. 642; 716, numquid delinquont rustici? Men. 620; Most. 548; 750.

b) Questions expecting a negative *answer* (25), e.g. Asin. 830, numquidnam tibi molestumst, si haec nunc mecum accubat? Men. 1146; Pseud. 1329, numquid iratus es? :: nil profecto; Rud. 832; Eun. 994; Phor. 563, numquid est quod opera mea vobis opus sit? :: nil.

c) *numquid*, with negative *effect*, in questions challenging the hearer to deny an evident fact (26), e.g. Pers. 462, numquid moror? 726; Rud. 736, numqui minus hasce esse oportet liberas? M. G. 1130; Eun. 475, numquid habes quod contemnas? Ad. 689.

d) *numquid vis ?* (41). In this frequent formula of leave-taking there seems to be no negative connotation. Examples: Amph. 542; 544; Bacch. 604; Trin. 192; Hec. 272; Ad. 432. Similar are Eun. 213, numquid aliud imperas; Trin. 198, numquid rogaturus? Poen. 911, numquid me morare? *num quippiam* is found in Pers. 735; Truc. 432.

Where *quid* is adverbial, *numquid* hardly differs from *num*, e.g. Pers. 551, numquid in principio cessavit dicere? Pseud. 1329; And. 943.

C. Questions Introduced by *ecquis, ecquid, enumquam.*

1. In the masculine and feminine, and in the neuter as subject or object, *ecquis* (barring a few exceptions to be noted below) is a colorless interrogative-indefinite (48), e.g. Amph. 856, dic mihi verum serio, ecquis alius Sosia intust? Rud. 1033, ecquem in his locis novisti? Epid. 441; M. G. 782; Truc. 508; Enn. Ann. 230, ecquid erit praemi? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 24, 8, ecqua tandem lex est quae dicat?

In Merc. 844, ecquisnam deust qui mea nunc laetus laetitia fuat? there is an expectation of a negative answer; so also Rud. 971; Eun. 1031.

2. *ecquid* with adverbial force (28), e.g. Asin. 900, ecquid matrem

amas? Men. 146, ecquid adsimulo similiter? Most. 906, ecquid placent? And. 871, ecquid te pudet? Eun. 456. "In many of these cases *ecquid* has degenerated into an interrogative particle (cf. *numquid*). It generally has neutral effect, but like *-ne* or *num* it may be used in circumstances which admit only one answer, and so may seem to expect an affirmative or negative." (Morris, p. 54).

Upon *ecquis* in general Morris endorses the observation of Dräger, i, p. 344, that while this type of question does not have a special meaning, yet it often indicates a certain degree of importunity.

3. *enumquam:* Men. 925, enumquam intestina tibi crepant? Rud. 987, sed tu enumquam piscatorem vidisti, venefice, vidulum piscem cepisse? 1117; Trin. 590; Phor. 329, en enumquam iniuriarum audisti mihi scriptam dicam? 348.

D. Questions without Interrogative Particle.

1. Sentences whose interrogative force is slight or questionable (75).

a) Expressions (25) of the type of Aul. 397, sed cesso priusquam prorsus perii currere? Capt. 827, sed ego cesso hunc Hegionem onerare laetitia? Editors usually take these as questions (though obviously not expecting an answer). Yet some punctuate them with a period. I incline to regard them as interrogative, though unable to furnish convincing arguments in favor of this view. Other examples are Aul. 627; Epid. 342; Merc. 130; M. G. 896; Pers. 197; Truc. 630; And. 845; H. T. 410; Pacuv. 111; Acc. 519; Turp. 212.

b) Many sentences introduced by *nempe*[1] (37), e.g. Aul. 293, nempe huc dimidium dicis, dimidium domum; Asin. 116, apud Archibulum ego ero argentarium. :: nempe in foro? 339; Bacch. 189, nempe recte valet? :: istuc volebam ego ex te percontarier; 689; Cist. 600; Curc. 43, ei ancillula est. :: nempe huic lenoni qui hic habitat; And. 30; 194, Davos sum, non Oedipus. :: nempe ergo aperte vis quae restant me loqui? :: sane quidem; Eun. 563; Hec. 105. Some of these seem distinctly interrogative, as shown by the answers in Bacch. 188 and And. 194, but most of them hover between the declarative and interrogative value.

[1] Langen, Beiträge zum Plautus, p. 125 ff.

c) Sentences with *fortasse, fortassis, scilicet* (13), e.g. Amph. 726, tu me hic vidisti? :: ego, inquam . . . :: in somnis fortassis? Bacch. 671, Chrysale, occidi. :: fortassis tu auri dempsisti parum? Curc. 324; Pers. 21; 441; Rud. 142; Phor. 145, non multum habet quod det fortasse? 901; Eun. 346, comites secuti scilicet sunt virginem? H. T. 705; Phor. 695. These are of the same nature as sentences with *nempe* above mentioned.

2. Repetitions in which a speaker takes up and repeats words just used by the other person in the dialogue. The effect is exclamatory rather than interrogative (209).

a) The words are repeated without change and the verb is not expressed (52), e.g. Amph. 692, ut dudum dixeras. :: dudum? Capt. 838, cedo manum! :: manum? Merc. 736; Most. 383; And. 328, si id non potest aut tibi nuptiae haec sunt cordi, — :: cordi! H. T. 192; Ad. 700.

b) Slight changes are made in the repeated words, especially in the person of pronouns (26), e.g. Curc. 582, tuom libertum. :: meum? Men. 282; Eun. 798, ego non tangam meam? :: tuam! Hec. 209; Capt. 148, alienus . . . :: alienus ego! alienus ille! Aul. 784.

c) The verb, if it is in the 3d person, may be repeated without change, either with or without other words (25), e.g. Curc. 173, te prohibet erus. :: prohibet! Epid. 698, lubuit. :: ain tu? lubuit! Merc. 181; And. 875, ita praedicant. :: ita praedicant? H. T. 606; Ad. 934.

d) The verb may be changed in person, and other changes or additions may be made (54), e.g. Aul. 759, quod subrupuisti meum. :: surrupio ego tuom! Bacch. 681; M. G. 556; And. 617, at iam expediam. :: expedies! H. T. 720.

e) The repeated verb is in the subjunctive (52).

1) Repetitions of an imperative, e.g. Aul. 829, i, redde aurum! :: reddam ego aurum!

2) The imperative is only implied or is expressed in the form of a question, Bacch. 627, non taces? :: taceam!

3) Repetitions of a subjunctive, e.g. Pseud. 1226, Pseudolum mihi dedas. :: Pseudolum ego tibi dedam!

4) Passages in which the rejected idea is not distinctly

expressed in a preceding utterance, e.g. Capt. 208, at fugam fingitis. : : nos fugiamus!

For full material under these last four heads, see p. 187 ff.

3. *Rogas, negas, rogitas* **and similar verbs, with exclamatory force (81).**

1) *rogas, rogitas, negas* alone (49), e.g. Aul. 634, quid tibi vis reddam ? : : rogas ? Epid. 64, amatne istam . . .? : : rogas ? Poen. 263; Trin. 80; And. 184, qua de re ? : : rogas ? 909; Ad. 558; Aul. 339, qui vero ? : : rogitas ? Rud. 1361; H. T. 631, quid ego feci ? : : rogitas ? Eun. 675; Phor. 156; Curc. 711, non commemini dicere. : : quid ? negas ? Aul. 764; Men. 306; M. G. 829; Phor. 740, estne hic Stilpo ? : : non. : : negas ?

2) *rogas, rogitas, negas* followed by other words (10), e.g. Cas. 997, rogitas etiam ? Men. 713, rogas me ? Eun. 653; H. T. 251, rogitas quid sit ? Rud. 1067, negas quod video ?

3) With a few other verbs (22), e.g. Bacch. 777, quid fit ? quam mox navigo ? taces ? Hec. 527, peperit filia. Hem, taces ? Eun. 695; 821; so also *derides*, Merc. 909; Ad. 852; *inrides*, And. 204; *narras*, H. T. 520; *cessas:* Hec. 360; 814; Turp. 1, intus cessas ? Enn. Trag. 182, gradum proferre pedum cessas ?

4. Questions with *non* and other negative words (202).

a) *non* in repetitions, either with or without a verb (23), e.g. And. 194, non hercle intellego. : : non ? H. T. 780; Ad. 661; Epid. 482, haec non est ea. : : quid ? non est ? Most. 595, non dat, non debet. : : non debet ? Poen. 173; H. T. 612; Hec. 342. Most of these are purely exclamatory.

b) Other questions with *non* (165).

1) *non* and the verb are at the beginning of the sentence (80), e.g.
non vides, e.g. Asin. 472, non vides irasci ? Most. 811; H. T. 1013; Acc. Trag. 608.

non tu scis, e.g. Merc. 732, non tu scis quae sit illaec ? Men. 714; Amph. 703; Com. Incert. 46.

Other verbs in 2d person present indicative, e.g. Asin. 476, non audes ? Pseud. 230, non audis ? 612, non soles respicere te ? Com. Incert. 85, non intellegis ? H. T. 239, non cogitas ? Stat. 183, non vis ? etc. Men. 294, non nosti meum nomen ? Truc. 595.

Perfect indicative, 2d person, e.g. Epid. 639, non meministi ? And. 852, non tu dixti ? Afran. 97, non audisti ? etc.; Rud. 355.

Impersonals, e.g. M. G. 1404, non licet mihi dicere ? Asin. 935; *non pudet:* Men. 708; Phor. 525.

Other tenses and persons: Epid. 599, non poteras novisse ? Eun. 696, non dicturu's ? Merc. 750, non estis cenaturi ? Cas. 737, non sum liber ? Phor. 543, non triumpho ? Hec. 360, non sciunt ipsi viam ? Eun. 839; Phor. 804, non norat patrem ? Hec. 341, non visam uxorem ! For complete material illustrating the subjunctive, see p. 183; 191.

2) *non* and the verb together, but not at the beginning of the sentence; in most cases at or near the end (19).

First Person : Afran. 122, puella non sum, supparo si induta sum?

Second person, e. g. Epid. 514, fides non reddis? Eun. 463, hunc non vides ? Men. 505, tuom parasitum non novisti ? Aul. 772; M. G. 698, nutrici non missuru's quicquam ? Phor. 384, sobrinum tuom non noras ? Crassus (Meyer), p. 270, tu imagines ipsas non perhorrescis ?

Third person, e.g. Hec. 231, cum puella anum suscepisse inimicitias non pudet ? Stat. 98, mihi non sunt balneae ?

With subjunctive, e.g. Eun. 798, ego non tangam ? 591.

In force the few cases just enumerated under 2) do not differ from those cited under 1).

3) *non* and the verb are separated, *non* being at the beginning, the verb generally at the end (66).

First person, e.g. Amph. 518, non ego te novi ? so also Capt. 564; Men. 407; Afran. 253; H. T. 920, non tibi ego exempli satis sum? Rud. 1125; Men. 511, non ego te foras exire vidi? Pacuv. 149.

Second person, e.g. Pers. 385, non tu nunc hominum mores vides ? Epid. 638, non me novisti ? Ad. 560, non tu eum rus hinc modo produxe aibas ? And. 921, non tu tuom malum aequo animo feras ? Eun. 819; Hec. 603; Stat. 41, non haec putas ? non haec in corde vorsantur tibi ? Lucil. 242, non hoc quid valeat cognosces ?

Third person, e.g. Bacch. 1193, non tibi venit in mentem ? 1000; Phor. 392, non te horum pudet ? Hec. 236; Afran. 346

Subjunctive, e.g. Epid. 588, non patrem ego te nominem ! Eun. 322; Trin. 133, non ego illi argentum redderem ! Phor. 119, non ei pater veniam daret !

Without verb, e.g. Asin. 652, libertos. :: non patronos? And. 149.

Of the above three divisions of *non*-questions, 1) and 2) seem to be exclamatory. The third (with the verb at the end) are real questions, and are taken by Morris (p. 72) as the origin of the *nonne*-questions, which likewise are real questions and have the verb at or near the end of the sentence.

c) Other negatives used in questions without a particle (14).

1) *nil,* e.g. *nil respondes,* Poen. 259; Eun. 152; Ad. 641; other combinations: And. 949; Eun. 735; Hec. 462; Ad. 244.

2) *nullus:* Bacch. 718, Pistoclero nulla amica est? Pseud. 1002.

3) *nemo:* Ad. 529, hospes nemost vobis?

4) *neque . . . neque:* Amph. 756, neque tu illi neque mihi viro ipsi credis? Pers. 131.

d) For *non* with the 2d person present indicative with imperative force, see p. 25.

5. Questions with *iam* and *etiam*.

a) *iam* (50).

1) First person: Men. 176, iam fores ferio? Eun. 814, iam dimitto exercitum? Both these are deliberative.

2) Second person (29), e.g. Amph. 798, iam tu quoque huius adiuvas insaniam? Asin. 338, iam devorandum censes, si conspexeris? Epid. 25; 401; Most. 836; Eun. 703, iam satis credis sobriam esse me? Ad. 290; Amph. 962, iam vos rediistis in concordiam? H. T. 350, iam hoc quoque negabis tibi placere? Trin. 912; Truc. 378.

3) Third person (19), e.g. Pers. 25, iam servi hic amant? 485, iam liberast? Eun. 704, iam satis certumst virginem vitiatam esse? Ad. 388; Amph. 957, iam pax est inter vos duos?

Iam in these questions at times seems merely a reënforcing particle, e.g. in Pers. 25; Amph. 798; H. T. 350 (all cited in full above), and elsewhere.

b) *etiam,* occasionally with the force of ' still,' ' yet,' ' again,' but more commonly used as a reënforcing particle.

1) *etiam,* 'still,' 'yet,' 'again' (22), e.g. Merc. 130, at etiam asto? Stich. 574, etiam valet? Asin. 677, furcifer, etiam me delusisti? Afran. 421, etiam quicquam egisti?

2) Reënforcing or intensifying *etiam.*

With imperative force (see p. 25) (19), e.g. Curc. 41, etiam taces? (= *tace!*); so also Pers. 152; Ad. 550; Pers. 278, etiam dicis ubi sit? Bacch. 670, etiam quid respondetis mihi? H. T. 235, etiam caves?

In purely exclamatory expressions (27), e.g. Bacch. 331, etiam rogas? so Merc. 202; And. 762; Aul. 424, etiam rogitas? Bacch. 785, etiam minitare? Pers. 290, etiam male loquere? Capt. 563, etiam male loqui audes? Merc. 763, etiam negas? 981, etiam loquere? Bacch. 910; Amph. 381; Most. 1132; Men. 499; Liv. And. Trag. 19, etiam minitas? Turp. 25, etiam me inrides? In Merc. 896, etiam metuis? and 981, etiam loquere, *etiam* may have the force of 'still'; so also in some other cases of this form, but this interpretation is never necessary. All of these examples under 2) are in the 2d person. An instance of the 3d person is found in Rud. 711, at etiam minitatur?

6. Continued and Supplementary Questions.

Morris (p. 77 ff.) distinguishes under this head the following categories:

a) Continued Questions (about 40). "To a previous question the speaker himself adds a second thought, either in a phrase or clause, in order to define the main question more precisely," e.g. Pseud. 616 ff. esne tu an non es ab illo milite Macedonio? servos eius qui est mercatus . . . dederat . . . debet? Phor. 739, quis hic loquitur? :: Sophrona. :: et meum nomen nominat? Aul. 772, dic bona fide: tu id aurum non subrupuisti? :: bona. :: neque scis quis id abstulerit? Poen. 879; Pseud. 484; H. T. 894; 973; Stich. 342.

b) Supplementary Questions (about 20). "Semi-interrogative phrases or clauses which supplement a remark made by another speaker," e.g. Hec. 809, dic me orare ut veniat. :: ad te? H. T. 778, argentum dabitur ei ad nuptias, aurum atque vestem qui — tenesne? :: comparet? Amph. 805, ego accubui simul. :: in eodem lecto? H. T. 905; Ad. 536; Phor. 209, quin abeo? :: et quidem ego? Rud. 1161, ubi loci sunt spes meae? :: immo edepol meae? Also questions with *si, sin, verum si, at si, etsi,* e.g. Phor. 492, nondum mihi credis? :: hariolare. :: sin fidem do? And. 348.

7. Other Questions without an Introductory Particle. These fall

into two classes according as the verb stands near the beginning or near the end.

a) Questions having the verb near the beginning (98).

1) Indicative present, 1st person (6), e.g. And. 423, sum verus? Enn. Trag. 335, tueor te senex? Most. 774, eon? voco huc hominem? with deliberative force; so also Poen. 1224, pergo (perge, *codd*) etiam temptare? M. G. 613, gerimus rem?

2) Indicative present, 2d person (36), e.g. Amph. 561, audes mihi praedicare id? Pers. 214, sed quid tu? confitere, ut te autumo? Eun. 705, credis huic quod dicat? Pers. 733, redis tu tandem? 379, scis nam tibi quae praecepi? Acc. 430, reicis abs te religionem? 433, creditis me amici morte inluturum manus? Lucil. 394, aurum vis? 546; Trag. Incert. 34, itis, paratis arma quam primum, viri? with imperative force.

3) Indicative present 3d person (22), e.g. Men. 923, solent tibi umquam oculi duri fieri? Poen. 755, valent apud te quos volo? Rud. 803, licet saltem istas appellare? Phor. 352, negat Phanium esse hanc sibi cognatam Demipho? hanc Demipho negat esse cognatam? Ad. 924, iubet frater? Aul. 357, sunt asseres? Men. 1107; Pacuv. 277, parum est quod te aetas male habet? Liv. And. Trag. 15, mirum videtur?

4) Indicative imperfect: Phor. 902, verebamini ne id non facerem? Ad. 693.

5) Indicative future: Truc. 205, ibo igitur intro? Hec. 672; Curc. 73, quid! te antepones Veneri iaientaculo? Ad. 193; Afran. 232, contemnes? Lucil. 279.

6) Indicative perfect (14), e.g. M. G. 829, prompsisti tu vinum? Poen. 723, vidistis leno quom aurum accepit? Rud. 378, cavistis ergo tu atque erus ne abiret? H. T. 978; Rud. 982, ausu's comparare vidulum cum piscibus?

7) Indicative pluperfect, Eun. 429, audieras?

8) Subjunctive. These are chiefly deliberative (11); see p. 181. Examples: Asin. 878, possis, si forte conspexeris, cognoscere? is potential. The imperfect subjunctive occurs Ad. 395.

A comparison of the foregoing material shows that about a third of the questions under this head are exclamatory. The remainder are questions asking for information.

b) Questions having the verb at or near the end (221).

1) Indicative present, 1st person (10), e.g. And. 906, Andrium ego Critonem video? H. T. 579, haec ego praecipio tibi? Phor. 812, hanc igitur mittimus? (deliberative); And. 921; Titin. 161, mirior tibi videor? Amph. 391.

2) Indicative present, 2d person (77), e.g. Merc. 160, dormientis spectatores metuis ne ex somno excites? Asin. 398, tu id nunc refers? Men. 1155, ergo nunc iam vis conclamari auctionem fore? Pers. 681, quod te dignumst, me dignum esse vis? Most. 262; Pseud. 826, quid tu? divinis condimentis utere? Ad. 596, id quia non est a me factum, agis gratias? Phor. 985, sic agitis? And. 545, alium esse censes nunc me atque olim? H. T. 729, atque tu hanc iocari credis? And. 321, hodie uxorem ducis? Crassus (Meyer), p. 270 tu lucem aspicere audes? Pacuv. 210, mecum altercas? Trag. Incert. 84, naufragia, labes generis ignoras? Afran. 149; Lucil. 193.

3) Indicative present, 3d person (42), e.g. Bacch. 854, scelestus tibi videtur Chrysalus? Curc. 572, leno minitatur mihi meaeque pugnae optritae iacent? Ad. 244, omnes dentes labefecit? etiam insuper defraudat? Amph. 774, salvom signumst? H. T. 607; Lucil. 908a, lena lenam deserit? Stat. 96; Enn. Trag. 137, nos quiescere aequom est? 193, Menelaus me obiurgat? Acc. 18, regnum tibi permitti malunt?

4) Indicative imperfect (6), e.g. Men. 1122, dic mihi! uno nomine ambo eratis? Phor. 858, tu quoque aderas? Pers. 686; Ad. 465, nostrum amicum noras?

5) Indicative future (24), e.g. M. G. 1021, quid ego? hic astabo! Rud. 657; Capt. 892, dubium habebis? Poen. 729, si pultem, non recludet? Eun. 690, eo rediges me, ut nesciam? Hec. 232; Acc. 624, pro certo arbitrabor sortis oracla? 51, hospitem depositam interemes? Afran. 147, de vita ac morte domini fabulabere? Cato, Frag. (Jord.), 25, 1, Rhodiensibus id oberit? 24, 2, id nos priores facere occupabimus? 23, 17.

6) Indicative perfect (26), e.g. Asin. 410, hodie salvere iussi Libanum libertum? Eun. 420, quid? illud numquam tibi dixi? M. G. 1219, opsecro, tute ipsum convenisti? Eun. 241, simul consilium cum re amisti? Pacuv. 327, segregare abs te ausu's aut sine illo

Salaminem ingredi, neque es veritus? Afran. 69, nudius tertius tute advenisti? 441; And. 241, quid? Chremes id mutavit?

7) Indicative pluperfect, only Liv. And. Trag. 25, servis praesto-laras?

8) Subjunctive (35). The examples are all deliberative; see p. 181 ff.

About two thirds of the material falling under the above head consists of exclamatory questions.

E. Questions in the Infinitive.[1]

These are better considered as exclamations. I have treated them under the Infinitive, p. 423 ff.

F. *An* and Disjunctive Questions.[2]

1. The question with *an* is at the beginning of a speech and refers back to what has been said by the previous speaker (88), e.g. Most. 454, paene confregi fores. :: eho, an tu tetigisti has aedis? Asin. 837, credam, si te hilarum videro. :: an tu me tristem putas? M. G. 419, si quidem east. :: an dubium id tibist eam esse hanc? Pseud. 309, te vivom vellem. :: eho, an iam mortuast? And. 500, mihin quisquam (sc. renuntiavit)? :: an tute intellexti hoc adsimulari? H. T. 80, mihi sic est usus. :: an quoiquamst usus homini, se ut cruciet? Eun. 382, flagitium facimus. :: an id flagitiumst? Ad. 128, sicine agis? :: an ego totiens de eadem re audiam? Amph. 745; Bacch. 120; Rud. 578; Eun. 604; H. T. 990; Phor. 1009; Ad. 672; Acc. 665, an haec iam obliti sunt Phryges? 85; Naev. Com. 11, eho, an vicimus? 125; Crassus (Meyer), p. 267, an tu me his pignoribus existimas posse terreri? With *non:* Bacch. 121, an deus ullus Suavisatio? :: an non putasti esse umquam? And. 765, quid, Pamphili? :: eho, an non est? M. G. 301; Poen. 490; And. 781; 807; Eun. 959; Hec. 100.

2. The question with *an*, though not at the beginning of the speech, refers back to the words of the other speaker and the intervening sentence is parenthetic (11), e.g. Poen. 1194, sicut nos praestitimus

---

[1] Morris, p. 90 ff.

[2] Morris, p. 92 ff.; Hinze, De *an* particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos vi et usu, 1887.

pulchritudine. :: stulta es. an tu eo pulchra videre, opsecro, si . . .? Hec. 671, ego alam? :: quid dixti? an non alemus? Aul. 82; Eun. 857.

3. The question with *an* refers to something the speaker himself has said (43).

1) The preceding sentence is declarative (14), e.g. Amph. 1026, paene ecfregisti cardines. an foris censebas nobis publicitus prae-berier? And. 620, qui me ex tranquillissima re coniecisti in nuptias. an non dixi esse hoc futurum? Asin. 528; Men. 962; Hec. 215.

2) A *quis*-question precedes the question with *an* (27), e.g. Amph. 661, quid ille revortitur? an ille me temptat sciens? Most. 7, quid tibi clamitatiost? an ruri censes te esse? Eun. 907, quam ob rem? an quia pudet? Asin. 524; Most. 35; H. T. 543; Phor. 602; Hec. 356.

3) A question with *num* precedes: Poen. 1315, num tibi malae aut dentes pruriunt? an malam rem quaeris? Phor. 412.

anne is found Cist. 518, anne etiam quid vis consultura sis sciam? Truc. 666, anne oportuit? And. 851, anne est intus Pamphilus?

The usual doctrine concerning questions of the foregoing types is that they arise by ellipsis of the first member of complete disjunctive questions, but Morris (p. 95) well points out the difficulties in the way of this view. "There is," he remarks, "hardly a single one of these questions which naturally and easily suggests a complete disjunctive question; there is in most cases something forced and artificial in the ellipsis; and in some cases, e.g. Pseud. 1161; 1172; M. G. 822; 840, the awkwardness and artificiality are very clear . . . It is clear to me that it would be equally easy to supply a first member for all questions having -*ne* appended to the verb." It seems safest, therefore, to abandon the ellipsis theory, and regard *an* as originally a simple, not a disjunctive, particle.

In force these independent *an*-questions are largely exclamatory. Few of them ask for information. As a rule they express protest or surprise. It is this adversative force which has induced many scholars to accept Skutsch's etymology and derive *an* through *anne*[1] from **at-ne*. But it seems more natural to identify Latin *an* with

---

[1] Morris (p. 99) regards *an-ne* as a "further extension of -*ne* to sentences where it was not strictly necessary." Cf. *utrumne, numne.*

Greek ἄν; Gothic *an.* The latter particle also has adversative force; Brugmann, Kurze Vgl. Gramm. p. 615 (§ 831).

G. Complete Disjunctive Questions.

Complete disjunctive questions have the following forms:

1. *ne . . . an*, e.g. Asin. 504, nequeone ego ted interdictis facere mansuetem meis? an ita tu es animata ut qui expers matris imperio sies? Men. 319, satin hoc quod vides obsonatum est, an opsono amplius? Merc. 150, vin tu te mihi opsequentem esse an nevis? M. G. 1424, verberon etiam, an mittis? Trin. 332, mercaturan, an venalis habuit? Phor. 413; Ad. 336, patiamurne an narremus quoipiam? Enn. Trag. 68, seditio tabetne, an numeros augificat suos?

The foregoing examples are the only ones in which the two alternatives are expressed by verbs. In the following we have nouns, pronouns, adjectives, or adverbs: Amph. 343, servosne es an liber? Asin. 687, amandone exorarier vis ted an osculando? Bacch. 20, Cupidon tecum saevit anne Amor? Capt. 270; Cas. 405; compressan palma an porrecta ferio? Epid. 634, satin ego oculis utilitatem optineo sincere an parum? Men. 198, sanus non es. :: egone an tu magis? 1119; Merc. 128; 602; M. G. 784; 961; 965; 1020; Pseud. 610; Trin. 331; H. T. 203, huncine erat aequom ex illius more an illum ex huius vivere? Phor. 275; Ad. 185; Trag. Incert. 69, ferron an fato moerus Argivom occidit? Naev. Trag. 37, egone an ille iniurie facimus? 34; Liv. And. Com. 1, pulicesne an cimices an pedes? Enn. Trag. 232, domum paternamne anne ad Peliae filias? *-ne . . . an . . . an . . . an* occurs in Eun. 1045; and Crassus (Meyer), p. 270, patrimonione augendo, an iuri civili, an rei militari an eloquentiae?

2. *ne . . . an non*: Aul. 660, abin hinc an non? Capt. 74; 846, iuben an non iubes astitui aulas? Curc. 566; Epid. 538, estne ea an non est ea quam animus retur meus? M. G. 416; 449; Pers. 533; Pseud. 254, licetne an non licet? 616; 1246; Rud. 1399; Trin. 1071; Truc. 4, daturin estis an non? 755; 825; And. 186, hocine agis an non? 201, hoc intellextin? an non dum etiam hoc quidem? H. T. 405, videon Clinian an non? Phor. 852.

3. —— . . . *an:* Bacch. 162, tibi ego an tu mihi servos es ? 1167, etiam redditis nobis filios et servom ? an experior tecum vim maiorem ? Capt. 334, sed is privatam servitutem servit an publicam ? Curc. 589, maneam an abeam ? Merc. 903, vidistis an de audito nuntias ? Men. 915, album an atrum vinum potas ? Rud. 853, rapi te mavis an trahi ? Trin. 349, plus fit an minus ? Liv. And. Od. 26 ; Atta, 18, pater vilicatur tuos an mater vilica est ? Lucil. 803 ; Pacuv. 379.

4. —— . . . *an non:* M. G. 787, lautam vis an quae non dum sit lauta ? Pers. 378, futura es dicto oboediens an non patri ? Stich. 263 ; Trin. 983 ; And. 762, tibi ego dico an non ? Eun. 546 ; 968 ; H. T. 596 ; Phor. 147, pater eius rediit an non ?

5. *an* . . . *an:* Amph. 690, an te auspicium commoratum est an tempestas continet ? Epid. 223, quid erat induta ? an regillam induculam an mendiculam ?

6. *utrum* . . . *-ne* . . . *an.* Only two alternatives are here expressed and *-ne* is apparently redundant : Bacch. 75, utrum ego istuc iocon adsimulem an serio ? Rud. 104, sed utrum tu masne an femina es ? Stich. 699, utrum Fontine an Libero imperium te inhibere mavis ? Ad. 382, utrum studione id sibi habet an laudi putat fore ? Eun. 721, utrum praedicemne an taceam ?

7. *utrum* . . . *an:* Amph. 56, utrum sit an non voltis ? Cas. 290, utrum tu caelibem te esse mavis liberum an maritum servom aetatem degere ? Cist. 291, utrum deliras an astans somnias ? 641 ; Pers. 341 ; Pseud. 878, utrum tu amicis an inimicis daturu's cenam ? Rud. 781 ; Trin. 175, utrum indicare me aequom fuit . . . an ego alium dominum paterer fieri ?

8. *utrum* . . . *-ne* . . . *-ne:* Acc. 479, sed utrum terraene motus, sonitusne inferum pervasit auris ?

9. —— . . . *-ne:* Enn. Trag. 336, lumen iubarne in caelo cerno ? Acc. 537, ubi habet ? urbe agrone ?

It seems plausible to see in the examples cited under 6 and 7 the earliest types of the disjunctive question. In sentences like Rud. 104, sed utrum tu masne an femina es ? and Cist. 291, utrum deliras an astans somnias ? *utrum* was originally the neuter of the interrogative adjective, — ' which of the two is it ? ' etc. Cf. Naev. Com. 54, utrum est melius : virginem an viduam uxorem ducere ?

It was the context [1] and the slightly adversative force inherent in *an* that developed the meaning of 'or.' After the *utrum -ne . . . an* type of disjunctive question became established, *utrum* came to be felt to be superfluous; by its omission we get the *-ne . . . an* type, which for some reason became the favorite form in Early Latin. Similarly the *utrum . . . an* type often dispensed with *utrum*, thus giving us the ——— *. . . an* type, which is also fairly common in the Early period. But in the classical Latinity *utrum . . . an* asserts the supremacy.

[1] Wherever two questions come together, the ideas are, in the majority of cases, naturally alternative.

INDEX.